

Sylvan S. McCrary to be postmaster at Joaquin, Tex., in place of S. S. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

William I. Witherspoon to be postmaster at McAllen, Tex., in place of W. I. Witherspoon. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

Charles A. Reiter to be postmaster at Muenster, Tex., in place of C. A. Reiter. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

Charles I. Snedecor to be postmaster at Needville, Tex., in place of C. I. Snedecor. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

Lydia Teller to be postmaster at Orange Grove, Tex., in place of Lydia Teller. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

Casimiro P. Alvarez to be postmaster at Rio Grande, Tex., in place of C. P. Alvarez. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

George M. Sewell to be postmaster at Talpa, Tex., in place of G. M. Sewell. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

Charles F. Boettcher to be postmaster at Weimar, Tex., in place of C. F. Boettcher. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

UTAH

Carlos C. Hansen to be postmaster at Midvale, Utah, in place of J. B. Wright, deceased.

VIRGINIA

James L. Humbert to be postmaster at Charlottesville, Va., in place of W. B. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

Byron Austin to be postmaster at Falls Church, Va., in place of V. T. Quick, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

John M. Stratton to be postmaster at Man, W. Va., in place of R. E. Gillespie, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14 (legislative day of December 13), 1928

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

John W. Pole to be Comptroller of the Currency.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Minnie V. Compton, Pine Apple.

ALASKA

Martin Conway, Skagway.

COLORADO

Beulah J. Wright, Estes Park.

GEORGIA

Julien V. Frederick, Marshallville.

KANSAS

Robert E. Chapman, Belle Plaine.

William T. Venell, Bird City.

Clitus B. Hosford, Lawrence.

Theodore C. Conklin, Mulvane.

Clarence G. Hart, Perry.

George E. Crawford, Whiting.

KENTUCKY

Howard C. Lewis, Morehead.

Raymond H. Heskamp, St. Matthews.

Elbert W. Beers, Van Lear.

John Lafferty, Wheelwright.

MICHIGAN

Samuel Perkins, Norway.

Joseph D. Norris, Turner.

NEW JERSEY

Robert E. Torrance, Arlington.

Ralph E. Liddle, Fords.

George W. Karge, Franklinville.

James L. O'Donnell, Hammonton.

Walter G. Barber, Millville.

Walter E. Walling, Port Monmouth.

Harry W. Mutchler, Rockaway.

Marie M. Giroud, Sewaren.

Hiram H. Shepherd, South Boundbrook.

NEW MEXICO

Edward H. Hemenway, Carlsbad.

Frank P. Brown, Hachita.

John L. Augustine, Lordsburg.

Charles E. Anderson, Roy.

Louise N. Martin, Socorro.

OHIO

George P. Foresman, Circleville.

Alsina E. Andrews, Risingsun.

Horace G. Randall, Sylvania.

OKLAHOMA

Henry A. Ravia, Bessie.

Burton A. Tyrrell, Fargo.

Earl C. Moore, Forgan.

Benjamin F. Rarick, Guymon.

Helen Whitlock, Maramec.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John W. Willis, Lynchburg.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mary Allen, Filbert.

Minnie Ratliff, Yukon.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate December 14 (legislative day of December 13), 1928

POSTMASTER

ILLINOIS

Oscar B. Harrauff to be postmaster at Princeton in the State of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, December 14, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We entreat the spirit of the Lord God to be upon us. Let this day be an open door to another opportunity for service. Bless us with ease of mind in disappointment and with victory over every fear. Give us beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for heaviness. Let the revelation of eternal love be our ideal. Thus equipped, may we toil for the extension of the good. Empty our hearts of all jealousy, pride, and covetousness, and all selfishness which creates the bitterness of the world. In the calendar of memory may we live as wise servants of the Republic and obedient children of Him who has opened the gates of mercy for all mankind. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 14801. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and bill of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1928, on the 20th day of that month; and

H. R. 13990. An act to authorize the President to present the distinguished flying cross to Orville Wright, and to Wilbur Wright, deceased.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. McMASTER, and Mr. BLACK members of the committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) entitled "Joint resolution to appoint a congressional committee to attend the exercises celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first airplane flight made by Wilbur and Orville Wright on December 17, 1903, at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who informed the House that on the following dates the President did approve and sign bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 12, 1928:

H. R. 10869. An act amending section 764 of Subchapter XII, fraternal beneficial associations, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

On December 13, 1928:

H. R. 279. An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867; and

H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co., of Fayetteville, Tenn.

REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 14670 be transferred from the Committee on Territories to the Committee on Ways and Means. I have consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Territories in regard to this.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what was the gentleman's request?

Mr. HAWLEY. I was asking for the transfer from the Committee on Territories to the Committee on Ways and Means of the bill H. R. 14670, introduced by the Delegate from Hawaii [Hon. V. S. K. Houston], to amend section 495, title 48, chapter 3, of the United States Code, exempting salaries of officers and employees of the Territory of Hawaii from the Federal income tax, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the transfer of the bill will be made.

There was no objection.

PRESENTATION OF A GAVEL TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with the greatest pleasure that I was able this morning to present to you a gavel fashioned from the wood of a tree which grew in the front yard of the Hoover home in Iowa. In this connection I should like permission to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a short statement sent to me by Mr. Robert Reed Wallace, who sent the gavel to me for presentation to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

If this bit of wood could speak our language, it would tell of the beginning of the journey of a care-free little boy from a 2-room house on a frontier prairie in Iowa to the White House in Washington, D. C.—to the greatest office in the gift of men and women—to the greatest responsibility that can rest on any one man in the world.

A sturdy blacksmith set up his forge and shop on the west branch of a little stream on the western prairie, and across the ox-cart road he established his home, and in the front yard of that home he and his good wife planted a tree, and that tree grew in the rich soil and pure air of Iowa—a little boy came and played under the friendly branches of that tree—the scythe of time took the father and mother and the relatives took the little boy and taught him the ways of the farm, and the country school, on which there is no better foundation to build a man, and that man is now the President elect of the United States, the highest office in the gift of men and women, and the greatest possible responsibility that can rest on any man in the world.

This gavel was fashioned of wood out of the tree planted by Mr. Hoover's father and mother—intrinsically it has little value, while inspirationally it has immeasurable value if we will allow it to epitomize what can be accomplished by a boy who will apply the very best that is in him to every physical, mental, moral, social, political, and humanitarian problem that presents itself to him, and it is with that inspirational value in mind that the gavel is now presented to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The people of the United States and of the world are expecting much of Mr. Hoover and his accomplished wife, and I have faith that they will measure up as far as it is possible for human beings to measure up, and I know we will have for our President a man well born, well educated, well seasoned, and widely experienced, a diligent, conscientious, humble, Christian gentleman.

ROBERT REED WALLACE,
Hamilton, Ill.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT ELECT

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (Rept. No. 1951) from the Committee on Rules on Senate Concurrent Resolution 24.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the

Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President elect of the United States on the 4th of March next.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to state that this is the usual resolution that is passed once in four years preceding the inauguration of a new President. This resolution is considered to be an authorization for an appropriation which will be carried in the deficiency bill.

I think that is all that is to be said about that at this time. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker appoints as members of that committee Mr. SNELL, Mr. DYER, and Mr. POU.

PENSIONS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14800) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers, sailors, and marines of said war, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana calls up the bill H. R. 14800, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14800) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers, sailors, and marines of said war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read.

The bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 501. Rose A. Patten.	H. R. 622. Anna Reyle.
H. R. 510. Nancy J. Cain.	H. R. 623. Emma S. De Gour.
H. R. 512. Carrie H. Frelove.	H. R. 625. Helen Schaffer.
H. R. 513. Mary E. Hanna.	H. R. 626. Mary J. Seaman.
H. R. 514. Naomi Johnson.	H. R. 627. Catharine A. Sellers.
H. R. 515. Addie Pipes.	H. R. 628. Ellen Seiders.
H. R. 520. Hulda A. Blake.	H. R. 629. Rebecca C. Betz.
H. R. 521. Margaret M. Cunningham.	H. R. 632. Annie Downs.
H. R. 524. Ellen Gebhart.	H. R. 633. Lavina Strohecker.
H. R. 525. Hannah Giffin.	H. R. 634. Rebecca E. Patterson.
H. R. 530. Sarah E. Shaferman.	H. R. 635. Elizabeth Marks.
H. R. 533. Barbara Bray.	H. R. 636. Sarah E. Mason.
H. R. 537. Sophronia Williams.	H. R. 638. Susan Dry.
H. R. 538. Margaretta C. Feay.	H. R. 640. Katharine Flaig.
H. R. 541. Rebecca E. Nuzum.	H. R. 641. Caroline Schweimler.
H. R. 543. Elcie Been.	H. R. 642. Anna Saul.
H. R. 545. Rebecca Neal.	H. R. 643. Caroline C. Fehr.
H. R. 546. Emma F. De Moss.	H. R. 644. Cordelia Fisher.
H. R. 550. Sallie Neidhardt.	H. R. 646. Emma R. Derr.
H. R. 552. Sarah B. Ray.	H. R. 647. Mary Dethampl.
H. R. 553. Sarah H. Miller.	H. R. 648. Mary Platz.
H. R. 555. Gertrude Wiedebusch.	H. R. 650. Mary B. Davis.
H. R. 557. Ary Shaw.	H. R. 652. Margaret Schlegel.
H. R. 559. Sivilla C. Moore.	H. R. 655. Annie R. Trout.
H. R. 560. Sarah V. Merrifield.	H. R. 657. Isabella Hain.
H. R. 562. Rhoda McEldowney.	H. R. 659. Anna M. Swavely.
H. R. 563. Mary R. McIlvain.	H. R. 660. Margaret M. Power.
H. R. 565. Mary E. Hohmann.	H. R. 662. Jennie S. Long.
H. R. 566. Catharine Geldbaugh.	H. R. 663. Catharine Michael.
H. R. 568. Eva Coffman.	H. R. 668. Ellen A. Williamson.
H. R. 580. Melara C. Abbott.	H. R. 671. Rebecca J. Reber.
H. R. 581. Theresa Bingaman.	H. R. 672. Amelia Reed.
H. R. 582. Sarah C. Aunsbach.	H. R. 674. Catharine E. Hassler.
H. R. 583. Rebecca Redcay.	H. R. 675. Emma R. Hartline.
H. R. 584. Mary C. Cooper.	H. R. 676. Mary A. Hinnerstiz.
H. R. 586. Margaret Reifsnnyder.	H. R. 677. Ellen E. Yeager.
H. R. 587. Emma L. Ermentrout.	H. R. 679. Rebecca E. Stamm.
H. R. 588. Sarah McCauley.	H. R. 680. Elizabeth Foos.
H. R. 589. Catharine McCloskey.	H. R. 681. Lavina Angstadt.
H. R. 591. Ellen Snyder.	H. R. 682. Lovina S. Knoll.
H. R. 592. Susie C. Rishell.	H. R. 683. Sarah M. Orner.
H. R. 598. Catharine Leas.	H. R. 686. Louisa Aulenbach.
H. R. 599. Amanda Wade.	H. R. 687. Clara Geiger.
H. R. 600. Eva A. Spear.	H. R. 688. Mary I. Flanagan.
H. R. 601. Mary C. Calvin.	H. R. 689. Susan Achenbach.
H. R. 602. Lucy Hock.	H. R. 691. Mary Ann Miller.
H. R. 603. Sarah Berheiser.	H. R. 693. Agnes F. Gibson.
H. R. 604. Catharine Hoover.	H. R. 694. Lydia Gery.
H. R. 607. Emily V. Ressler.	H. R. 695. Catharine Rader.
H. R. 608. Josephine Butterweck.	H. R. 696. Sarah Ann Garnet.
H. R. 610. Anna M. Rode.	H. R. 699. Lizzie H. Graul.
H. R. 611. Sarah Ulrich.	H. R. 701. Annie Boyer.
H. R. 613. Hannah A. Brittain.	H. R. 702. Haneefa Boyer.
H. R. 614. Elizabeth P. Weidner.	H. R. 703. Catharine Reeder.
H. R. 615. Sarah Sauerwine.	H. R. 704. Susan Gehret.
H. R. 617. Tamsen A. Wells.	H. R. 708. Elizabeth F. Miller.
H. R. 618. Amelia Grosscup.	H. R. 709. Martha Beamerderfer.
H. R. 619. Kate Grommis.	H. R. 710. Anna M. Rumford.
H. R. 620. Eleisie A. Kern.	H. R. 711. Susan Griffith.
H. R. 621. Lucy Kern.	H. R. 712. Mary A. Kinch.

H. R. 713. Kittle A. Miltower.	H. R. 1091. Esther E. Lazelle.	H. R. 1347. Sophia Swaney.	H. R. 1761. Hannah McGuyer.
H. R. 714. Hannah M. J. Myers.	H. R. 1093. Mary Van Wormer.	H. R. 1348. Lavina P. Swaney.	H. R. 1762. Ellen McKinty.
H. R. 716. Emma M. Ebbert.	H. R. 1096. Mary J. Ansell.	H. R. 1352. Sarah J. Vaughan.	H. R. 1763. Anna E. Schermerhorn.
H. R. 717. Kate Winter.	H. R. 1098. Matilda M. Ballard.	H. R. 1355. Annie V. Young.	H. R. 1765. Cella P. Rose.
H. R. 719. Elizabeth Graf.	H. R. 1099. Elizabeth Baty.	H. R. 1356. Kate A. Zinn.	H. R. 1766. Mary R. Sheffer.
H. R. 720. Mary E. Reeser.	H. R. 1100. Isabel C. Bennett.	H. R. 1367. Luella E. Shaw.	H. R. 1768. Maria Simpson.
H. R. 722. Ellen Smith.	H. R. 1101. Annie H. Bills.	H. R. 1371. Margaret L. Spencer.	H. R. 1769. Helen P. Smith.
H. R. 723. Emma L. Smith.	H. R. 1102. Caroline Boerodalle.	H. R. 1373. Clemania Parker.	H. R. 1770. Jane L. Smith.
H. R. 724. Elizabeth Bressler.	H. R. 1103. Eva E. Bowman.	H. R. 1374. Helen S. Glidden.	H. R. 1773. Amelia H. Stone.
H. R. 725. Sarah H. Cleaver.	H. R. 1107. Catherine Connor.	H. R. 1375. Eliza Schutt.	H. R. 1774. Julia A. Stimpson.
H. R. 727. Hannah F. Hauck.	H. R. 1108. Edwina C. Cook.	H. R. 1376. Mary J. Hurley.	H. R. 1775. Louisa Taffe.
H. R. 728. Margaret L. Briner.	H. R. 1109. Mary Jane Cooper.	H. R. 1378. Albina D. Thom.	H. R. 1776. Katherine E. Tarbell.
H. R. 729. Anna J. Bright.	H. R. 1111. Sarah A. Coyle.	H. R. 1399. Lavina M. Norton.	H. R. 1778. Marcella Tetro.
H. R. 731. Maria Roth.	H. R. 1112. Mary Crelly.	H. R. 1400. Mary E. Halsey.	H. R. 1779. Louise F. Thomson.
H. R. 733. Susan Shell.	H. R. 1113. Charlotte V. Cruser.	H. R. 1414. Nannie L. Brand.	H. R. 1781. Mary J. Evans.
H. R. 734. Rachel L. Shultz.	H. R. 1114. Sarah R. H. Culbertson.	H. R. 1415. Mary E. Wooley.	H. R. 1783. Clara J. Dwyer.
H. R. 735. Amanda Worley.		H. R. 1416. Catherine Weitner.	H. R. 1788. Electa J. Baker.
H. R. 737. Annie Snayberger.	H. R. 1120. Oriana M. Farnham.	H. R. 1423. Emily Raber.	H. R. 1790. Anna Dunkley.
H. R. 738. Mary L. Williams.	H. R. 1121. Emma J. Fogarty.	H. R. 1434. Vina Herron.	H. R. 1792. Julia Deridder.
H. R. 739. Annie E. Mozingo.	H. R. 1124. Ann Fox.	H. R. 1435. Lydia Haven.	H. R. 1794. Rosanna Cushing.
H. R. 742. Anna B. Shaw.	H. R. 1125. Frances L. Gamble.	H. R. 1439. Mary E. Fellows.	H. R. 1796. Hannah Cull.
H. R. 747. Hannah Clark.	H. R. 1129. Martha J. Heindold.	H. R. 1440. Mariah Evans.	H. R. 1797. Edith Crandall.
H. R. 748. Mary Buchanan.	H. R. 1130. Lucy A. Hodges.	H. R. 1441. Sarah Doolin.	H. R. 1799. Mary Connor.
H. R. 756. Samantha A. Mewhinney.	H. R. 1132. Abigail D. Hunt.	H. R. 1442. Fetney Jane Devore.	H. R. 1800. Rosetta Connelly.
H. R. 757. Fidelia E. Lane.	H. R. 1134. Josephine C. Jones.	H. R. 1443. Mary A. Delay.	H. R. 1802. Mary F. Case.
H. R. 758. Sarah E. Chandler.	H. R. 1142. Elizabeth McDowell.	H. R. 1445. George Ann Cunningham.	H. R. 1803. Elizabeth Fredericks.
H. R. 759. Mary E. McConnell.	H. R. 1143. Susie Mahoney.	H. R. 1446. Pauline E. Beals.	H. R. 1805. Lucinda Bullock.
H. R. 761. Fannie H. Buchanan.	H. R. 1145. Ida Milan.	H. R. 1447. Anna Blue.	H. R. 1807. Lucy A. Brown.
H. R. 763. Mary A. Dorrel.	H. R. 1146. Alice Montondo.	H. R. 1453. Louisa Reeves.	H. R. 1808. Annie Brazier.
H. R. 764. Eva B. Frazier.	H. R. 1149. Mary Neff.	H. R. 1454. Eunice Morris.	H. R. 1815. Angeline Davis.
H. R. 765. Isabella A. Long.	H. R. 1150. Margaret O'Leary.	H. R. 1458. Julia A. Crouse.	H. R. 1820. Sarah E. Terwilliger.
H. R. 805. Mary A. McBride.	H. R. 1154. Anne Parsons.	H. R. 1462. Rowena R. Coombs.	H. R. 1823. Elizabeth Bogart.
H. R. 806. Fredonia A. Lauder.	H. R. 1158. Nellie Regan.	H. R. 1471. Fannie Hudson.	H. R. 1824. Mary A. Lohnes.
H. R. 808. Anna Fetsch.	H. R. 1165. Gertrude Siebert.	H. R. 1472. Sally Smith.	H. R. 1826. Ollie Fye.
H. R. 810. Mary Ann Leary.	H. R. 1166. Frances E. Simpson.	H. R. 1474. Martha F. Vanzant.	H. R. 1827. Nancy E. Mount.
H. R. 828. Emma A. Young.	H. R. 1167. Louise A. Smith.	H. R. 1476. Susan J. Hendrick.	H. R. 1828. Anna Mathews.
H. R. 829. Anna Erwin.	H. R. 1168. Elizabeth J. Spencer.	H. R. 1478. Margaret E. Wallace.	H. R. 1829. Permelia Gorbam.
H. R. 831. Susan D. Ralph.	H. R. 1169. Ida H. Stokes.	H. R. 1482. Mary E. Brooks.	H. R. 1831. Mary J. Hardy.
H. R. 832. Bridget E. Lovejoy.	H. R. 1170. Margaret A. Sutton.	H. R. 1513. Margaret E. Laux.	H. R. 1834. Rebecca A. Grubbs.
H. R. 835. Sarah J. McFarlan.	H. R. 1172. Florence Tripp.	H. R. 1514. Amanda E. Rogers.	H. R. 1835. Jane Ward.
H. R. 837. Melissa L. Spader.	H. R. 1175. Ida M. Wheeler.	H. R. 1515. Amelia C. Burrows.	H. R. 1839. Sarah A. Smith.
H. R. 840. Jeannette M. Sheldon.	H. R. 1178. Mary A. Wilson.	H. R. 1516. Mary L. Woodhull.	H. R. 1840. Melissa A. Anthony.
H. R. 842. Alice Jordan.	H. R. 1180. Minerva A. Woodruff.	H. R. 1517. Amelia Conlon.	H. R. 1841. Lovina Wort.
H. R. 846. Beatrice Murphy.	H. R. 1181. Mary E. Young.	H. R. 1526. Mary McAndrew.	H. R. 1845. Sarah E. Harrell.
H. R. 869. Mamie E. Robinson.	H. R. 1184. Sophia M. Barth.	H. R. 1544. Mary Smith.	H. R. 1846. Amanda A. Osborn.
H. R. 873. Sarah J. Brown.	H. R. 1210. Nancy Bachor.	H. R. 1545. Eliza C. Greene.	H. R. 1847. Harriet M. Brown.
H. R. 874. Christina Stein.	H. R. 1211. Frances Bicknell.	H. R. 1565. Isabel R. Mayes.	H. R. 1848. Salina Wilt.
H. R. 875. Mary I. Courtney.	H. R. 1212. Annie Bowman.	H. R. 1566. Sarah Gochey.	H. R. 1849. Dora L. Coddington.
H. R. 877. Serena Swift.	H. R. 1213. Phebe Carlton.	H. R. 1568. Frances Somerville.	H. R. 1850. Eva Bless.
H. R. 878. Mary F. Frame.	H. R. 1214. Ella A. Coleman.	H. R. 1569. George A. Wallace.	H. R. 1851. Susannah R. Daves.
H. R. 881. Janette Stokes.	H. R. 1215. Mary E. B. Davidson.	H. R. 1570. Ellen Drohan.	H. R. 1852. Emily J. Flanigan.
H. R. 882. Isabella Conner.	H. R. 1216. Catherine Doran.	H. R. 1572. Nancy J. Hope.	H. R. 1853. Clarinda Curies.
H. R. 884. Hannah J. Gibson.	H. R. 1218. Virginia L. Grosvenor.	H. R. 1573. Sarah J. Gott.	H. R. 1854. Harriet M. Simmons.
H. R. 885. Caroline Uphoff.	H. R. 1220. Annie Hastings.	H. R. 1577. Martha M. Fairchild.	H. R. 1855. Sarah M. Ferguson.
H. R. 891. Ann E. Trampe.	H. R. 1223. Clarinda Johnson.	H. R. 1579. Elizabeth Lawton.	H. R. 1856. Anna Ambrose.
H. R. 892. Emma Clark.	H. R. 1228. Arvilla Ours.	H. R. 1581. Julia A. Rosenberger.	H. R. 1857. Liddy J. Beck.
H. R. 893. Judith Ann Hay.	H. R. 1231. Delia D. Phillips.	H. R. 1592. Susan A. Whiting.	H. R. 1858. Fostina Hatt.
H. R. 894. Nancy T. Tyler.	H. R. 1233. Mary E. Rankin.	H. R. 1599. Harriet N. Crabb.	H. R. 1859. Emma Stonebraker.
H. R. 896. Susan F. Miller.	H. R. 1236. Nancy Ann Rouse.	H. R. 1602. Charicta A. Blossom.	H. R. 1860. Abbie C. Britton.
H. R. 899. Mary F. June.	H. R. 1237. Missouri F. Sanders.	H. R. 1603. Evelyn Reynolds.	H. R. 1861. Eliza McDaniel.
H. R. 900. Mary L. Vance.	H. R. 1239. Adaline E. Shiers.	H. R. 1605. Margaret E. Vinling.	H. R. 1862. Adeline R. McCorkle.
H. R. 901. Elizabeth Herring.	H. R. 1240. Mary E. Small.	H. R. 1606. Margaret Gates.	H. R. 1863. Alice J. McClelland.
H. R. 902. Lidy Shaul.	H. R. 1241. Elizabeth Stobert.	H. R. 1607. Sarah E. Purdy.	H. R. 1864. Lucy J. Swearingen.
H. R. 903. Cynthia A. Henderson.	H. R. 1244. Josephine V. Walker.	H. R. 1608. Mary J. Dixon.	H. R. 1870. Ida V. Spencer.
H. R. 904. Sarah E. Sutton.	H. R. 1247. Mary M. Wilson.	H. R. 1609. Sarah A. V. Pepper.	H. R. 1873. Lydia E. Chapplear.
H. R. 965. Eliza E. Smith.	H. R. 1250. Helen L. Ferguson.	H. R. 1610. Ella S. Boomer.	H. R. 1874. Olive R. Chance.
H. R. 983. Antoinette F. Cushing.	H. R. 1251. Catherine Moore.	H. R. 1611. Ellen Manchester.	H. R. 1877. Lucinda Barnes.
H. R. 987. Emma J. Turner.	H. R. 1253. Victorena Rush.	H. R. 1612. Ella C. Daniels.	H. R. 1878. Louisa McMurtrey.
H. R. 990. Virginia Pace.	H. R. 1256. Johanna Neugebauer.	H. R. 1613. Mary B. Jennings.	H. R. 1880. Fannie Blood.
H. R. 991. Susan V. Faucett.	H. R. 1260. Matilda Wilson.	H. R. 1614. Sara M. Hamilton.	H. R. 1881. Emily A. Casselman.
H. R. 998. Mary A. Slater.	H. R. 1261. Catharine Klinker.	H. R. 1652. Louisa A. Snow.	H. R. 1882. Rebecca J. McClure.
H. R. 1012. Frances A. Williams.	H. R. 1263. Jennie Lindsey.	H. R. 1653. Mary E. Orth.	H. R. 1884. Emma D. Jones.
H. R. 1014. Clara B. Brown.	H. R. 1264. Jennie McDaniel.	H. R. 1655. Huldah A. Hudson.	H. R. 1889. Sarah S. Lutes.
H. R. 1015. Annie Ritchie.	H. R. 1266. Nancy S. Allen.	H. R. 1656. Sarah J. Driskill.	H. R. 1890. Caroline Maidel.
H. R. 1016. Amanda J. Cowan.	H. R. 1267. Edith V. Jones.	H. R. 1657. Hannah Dinsmore.	H. R. 1891. Eva H. Miller.
H. R. 1017. Laura A. Tarbell.	H. R. 1269. Emily D. Monk.	H. R. 1658. Margaret M. Mudgett.	H. R. 1896. Mary A. Ruch.
H. R. 1018. Susan Ingalls Nason.	H. R. 1274. Mary Everhart.	H. R. 1659. Minty E. Spears.	H. R. 1898. Alice M. Simmons.
H. R. 1031. Sarah E. Anderson.	H. R. 1275. Almira R. Graham.	H. R. 1660. Mary A. Nordyke.	H. R. 1900. Eliza Snyder.
H. R. 1032. Mary Drake.	H. R. 1281. Mary Hatfield.	H. R. 1661. Margaret A. Lincoln.	H. R. 1902. Louise Spade.
H. R. 1033. Margaret I. Wehrly.	H. R. 1282. Laura M. Julian.	H. R. 1663. Mary A. McCaw.	H. R. 1906. Janette L. Taylor.
H. R. 1035. Margaret C. Tiedeman.	H. R. 1285. Mary Pumpelly.	H. R. 1665. Nancy J. Griffey.	H. R. 1907. Ida A. Tuller.
H. R. 1036. Martha E. J. Milfin.	H. R. 1297. Eleanor E. Hugh.	H. R. 1666. Caroline S. Hunt.	H. R. 1908. Mary J. Turner.
H. R. 1037. Matilda Misener.	H. R. 1299. Kate S. Hyatt.	H. R. 1671. Emma J. Combs.	H. R. 1913. Emma B. Bush.
H. R. 1038. Amelia Manco.	H. R. 1301. Margaret A. Inks.	H. R. 1672. Lella E. Benham.	H. R. 1915. Carrie W. Christy.
H. R. 1039. Lydia Miller.	H. R. 1300. Carolin Johnson.	H. R. 1682. Elizabeth B. Fletcher.	H. R. 1917. Annie Donley.
H. R. 1041. Elizabeth Knott.	H. R. 1302. Nancy E. Keener.	H. R. 1691. Amanda Insell.	H. R. 1918. Mary A. Ellsworth.
H. R. 1043. Mary E. Green.	H. R. 1304. Edith P. Kerr.	H. R. 1698. Anna Craft.	H. R. 1920. Phebe H. B. Starr.
H. R. 1044. Augusta Dawson.	H. R. 1305. Amanda J. Kessler.	H. R. 1699. Theresa L. McCleary.	H. R. 1922. Jenettie E. Evans.
H. R. 1045. Emma J. Hatfield.	H. R. 1306. Margaret Kresler.	H. R. 1700. Della Lockwood.	H. R. 1923. Emma Greeley.
H. R. 1046. Emma Callaway.	H. R. 1309. Margaret Martin.	H. R. 1702. Fannie I. Lewis.	H. R. 1925. Mary M. Tinker.
H. R. 1048. Clara E. Criswell.	H. R. 1310. Sadie McEwen.	H. R. 1705. Valina Larose.	H. R. 1956. Lizzie M. Aspinwall.
H. R. 1050. Sarah R. Scott.	H. R. 1311. Susan McLaughlin.	H. R. 1706. Mary Laport.	H. R. 1971. Martha Bosley.
H. R. 1051. Alpha L. Dutler.	H. R. 1313. Sarah Morrison.	H. R. 1707. Ladora V. Lapham.	H. R. 1981. Sophia E. Ball.
H. R. 1055. Martha J. Treesh.	H. R. 1314. Mary Mostoller.	H. R. 1708. Julia Lackey.	H. R. 1983. Mary Jane Cressey.
H. R. 1056. Annie L. Shaffstall.	H. R. 1315. Donna M. Myers.	H. R. 1712. Mary E. Hulet.	H. R. 1984. Mary A. Harrington.
H. R. 1058. Elizabeth M. Richardson.	H. R. 1316. Rachel L. Pastorius.	H. R. 1714. Emma W. Hays.	H. R. 1986. Nancy A. Shields.
H. R. 1059. Bettie E. Rowsey.	H. R. 1318. Elizabeth S. Provance.	H. R. 1716. Abbie Hackett.	H. R. 2012. Laura Shaw.
H. R. 1060. Harriet Runlon.	H. R. 1322. Carrie S. Richey.	H. R. 1726. Damlie Fuller.	H. R. 2020. Ida S. Braisted.
H. R. 1061. Mary Pritchard.	H. R. 1323. Ellen Rininger.	H. R. 1728. Harriet S. Fellows.	H. R. 2027. Margaret Eggleston.
H. R. 1062. Isabel Pumpfrey.	H. R. 1325. Annie Arrington.	H. R. 1750. Mary S. Norton.	H. R. 2028. Clara J. Eldredge.
H. R. 1063. Nellie Misner.	H. R. 1326. Margaret Artis.	H. R. 1733. Cornelia J. Wilson.	H. R. 2032. Elizabeth W. Frank.
H. R. 1064. Magdaline Hartman.	H. R. 1328. Mollie M. Bell.	H. R. 1738. Flora L. Patterson.	H. R. 2038. Frances L. Holmes.
H. R. 1065. Mary D. Hatch.	H. R. 1330. Martha J. Buttermore.	H. R. 1740. Anna E. Pateman.	H. R. 2047. Mary Murray.
H. R. 1068. Rebecca A. Babcock.	H. R. 1331. Margaret Byers.	H. R. 1743. Mary Norton.	H. R. 2048. Emma M. Myers.
H. R. 1069. Frances A. Perkins.	H. R. 1332. Sarah E. Clouse.	H. R. 1745. Helen Potter.	H. R. 2050. Rosella Paukett.
H. R. 1070. Amanda D. Anderson.	H. R. 1335. Nannie Dively.	H. R. 1747. Jane Pelletier.	H. R. 2052. Cynthia L. Piercy.
H. R. 1074. Nancy L. Bell.	H. R. 1336. Hannah Ann Evans.	H. R. 1748. Phoebe Pecue.	H. R. 2053. Jennie Platt.
H. R. 1075. Margaret A. Curtis.	H. R. 1340. Malinda Gaumer.	H. R. 1749. Lottie Porter.	H. R. 2060. Jane A. Shampine.
H. R. 1076. Harriet Daub.	H. R. 1341. Susan Handlin.	H. R. 1751. Mahala J. Millias.	H. R. 2066. Sarah E. Wait.
H. R. 1081. Anna L. Tranbarger.	H. R. 1342. Rebecca Henry.	H. R. 1752. Aceneath E. Miller.	H. R. 2109. Florence Whitney.
H. R. 1083. Mary A. Lantz.	H. R. 1343. Emma Herring.	H. R. 1754. Lucy E. Moulton.	H. R. 2112. Abbie Cory.
H. R. 1084. Mary C. Blackburn.	H. R. 1344. Jennie Rutter.	H. R. 1755. Georgeanna Murray.	H. R. 2117. Mary A. Taggart.
H. R. 1085. Martha E. Maxfield.	H. R. 1345. Barbara Rummel.	H. R. 1757. Francis M. Nelson.	H. R. 2124. Louisa Denno.
H. R. 1090. Emma L. Howell.	H. R. 1346. Rachel J. Schock.		

- H. R. 2125. Frances E. Mack.
H. R. 2128. Helena Sargent.
H. R. 2129. Ellen Shaugnessy.
H. R. 2130. Mary Strong.
H. R. 2147. Sarah Dickie.
H. R. 2148. Josephine Christopher.
H. R. 2149. Emma C. Wiley.
H. R. 2150. Margaret Crawford.
H. R. 2159. Kate R. Forrester.
H. R. 2161. Lyte R. Buxton.
H. R. 2168. Lucinda E. Smith.
H. R. 2171. Anselma Huffine.
H. R. 2172. Ann Eliza Bell.
H. R. 2177. Ida Bishop.
H. R. 2178. Mary J. Hinman.
H. R. 2179. Hettie A. Overmyer.
H. R. 2181. Anna J. Newton.
H. R. 2194. Ida M. Jones.
H. R. 2208. Cynthia A. Bozell.
H. R. 2214. Martha E. Lett.
H. R. 2216. Permelia C. Wilson.
H. R. 2218. Matilda Aldrich.
H. R. 2219. Esther A. Wilson.
H. R. 2224. Susan Bruce.
H. R. 2225. Martha J. Cook.
H. R. 2233. Florence Hadrich.
H. R. 2238. Cornelia D. Haslet.
H. R. 2239. Mary A. Connor.
H. R. 2248. Mary Stanfield.
H. R. 2249. Sarah E. Wirick.
H. R. 2251. Mary E. McGinnis.
H. R. 2252. Anna C. Barber.
H. R. 2256. Lucy H. Bishop.
H. R. 2258. Catherine Ely.
H. R. 2259. Agnes A. Brown.
H. R. 2260. Sarah A. Wood.
H. R. 2261. Alice Wolff.
H. R. 2262. Emeretta Wilson.
H. R. 2263. Alida E. Whipple.
H. R. 2264. Lillian Swainston.
H. R. 2265. Anna Sullivan.
H. R. 2266. Clara Stalker.
H. R. 2268. Edith Richardson.
H. R. 2269. Madge Quinlan.
H. R. 2271. Fannie C. Nauman.
H. R. 2273. Ella Mix.
H. R. 2275. Emma Lezotte.
H. R. 2276. Almira Letts.
H. R. 2280. Mary P. E. Hale.
H. R. 2281. Delilah Ballard.
H. R. 2282. Mary J. Barclay.
H. R. 2283. Agnes Rundel.
H. R. 2285. Josephine Bushey.
H. R. 2289. Nancy E. Davis.
H. R. 2291. Emma J. Fitz.
H. R. 2292. Hannah Francisco.
H. R. 2293. Ernestene Friebe.
H. R. 2297. Mary A. Chandler.
H. R. 2302. Elizabeth J. Fry.
H. R. 2306. Hester A. Lynes.
H. R. 2308. Nianna M. Ruckel.
H. R. 2309. Rebecca Patterson.
H. R. 2315. Jennie E. Alyn.
H. R. 2317. Orinda Carson.
H. R. 2320. Emma A. Briles.
H. R. 2322. Malinda Johnson.
H. R. 2341. Sarah M. Berkheimer.
H. R. 2343. Nancy Jane Baker.
H. R. 2346. Maria L. Long.
H. R. 2353. Caroline Leff.
H. R. 2354. Lydia A. Swope.
H. R. 2362. Barbara F. Funk.
H. R. 2363. Amelia A. Halston.
H. R. 2364. Anna E. Humphrey.
H. R. 2366. Sarah E. Johnston.
H. R. 2366. Laura M. Kendig.
H. R. 2368. Annie Longabaugh.
H. R. 2371. Nancy Rohrbach.
H. R. 2373. Leticia Seibert.
H. R. 2377. Amelia B. Glendenning.
H. R. 2417. Eliza Gahrett.
H. R. 2418. Aravina M. Koons.
H. R. 2419. Sallie Chester.
H. R. 2443. Carrie H. Slingerland.
H. R. 2444. Ellen Van Kleeck.
H. R. 2446. Hannah S. Smith.
H. R. 2448. Cornelia B. Bacon.
H. R. 2449. Mary A. White.
H. R. 2450. Ella Mandigo.
H. R. 2452. Mary Kearsing.
H. R. 2454. Elizabeth Kissell.
H. R. 2455. Mary J. Powley.
H. R. 2458. Phebe J. Hammond.
H. R. 2460. Julia Baker.
H. R. 2461. Sarah A. Burt.
H. R. 2464. Eliza Parke.
H. R. 2465. Fannie Mainster.
H. R. 2466. Catherine Felly.
H. R. 2467. Martha Ball.
H. R. 2468. Elsie C. Nichols.
H. R. 2469. Mary S. Watt.
H. R. 2502. Hester E. Judd.
H. R. 2503. Joanna C. Palmer.
H. R. 2504. Mary Coggeshall.
H. R. 2505. Mary McGrath.
H. R. 2506. Levey Sidner.
H. R. 2507. Ellen Wornum.
H. R. 2510. Phebe J. Bell.
H. R. 2512. Martha S. Allison.
H. R. 2513. Ann E. Bickett.
H. R. 2515. Amanda M. Litchfield.
H. R. 2516. Hattie McKeehen.
H. R. 2517. Angeline Mow.
H. R. 2518. Julia B. Potter.
H. R. 2537. Jeannette Twomey.
H. R. 2540. Rhoda A. Byers.
H. R. 2543. Rosa I. Post.
H. R. 2547. Cornelia Splawn.
H. R. 2548. Nancy A. Brown.
H. R. 2549. Mary A. Bassett.
H. R. 2550. Katherine Brandt.
H. R. 2551. Amella A. Bunch.
H. R. 2552. Lucy A. Coffin.
H. R. 2553. Amyetta Kirk.
H. R. 2554. Ellen Thompson.
H. R. 2555. Lizzie M. Reynolds.
H. R. 2556. Mary C. Moyer.
H. R. 2560. Sarah H. Benedict.
H. R. 2562. Mary J. Diehl.
H. R. 2563. Lucia Furguson.
H. R. 2565. Etta E. Williams.
H. R. 2568. Francella Frost.
H. R. 2591. Sarah J. Weidner.
H. R. 2593. Mary R. Thomas.
H. R. 2596. Melissa A. Schneck.
H. R. 2597. Theressa P. Hardy.
H. R. 2598. Mary J. Goehard.
H. R. 2599. Mary T. Eagy.
H. R. 2600. Ally Dice.
H. R. 2602. Margie Combs.
H. R. 2603. Esther Carpenter.
H. R. 2605. Mary E. Lawhead.
H. R. 2607. Emma J. Ebert.
H. R. 2608. Malinda J. Holloper.
H. R. 2626. Alice Holderman.
H. R. 2627. Thurese F. Knight.
H. R. 2630. Mary A. Rardin.
H. R. 2631. Alicia Ralston.
H. R. 2633. Martha Stockley.
H. R. 2634. Orpy E. Oldham.
H. R. 2636. Lella J. Moore.
H. R. 2637. Carrie J. McClure.
H. R. 2639. Lucy A. Johnson.
H. R. 2641. Maggie Keylon.
H. R. 2642. Hannah C. Lindley.
H. R. 2643. Lacey Ladd.
H. R. 2645. Hannah E. Bennett.
H. R. 2674. Berintha Hancock.
H. R. 2681. Mollie M. Struble.
H. R. 2682. Mary C. Rupert.
H. R. 2683. Fanny T. Tate.
H. R. 2684. Mary E. Miller.
H. R. 2686. Mary Moore.
H. R. 2687. Adaline F. Hoff.
H. R. 2690. Sarah R. Weimer.
H. R. 2691. Isabella Burkhardt.
H. R. 2693. Sarah L. Rodkey.
H. R. 2694. Catharine Grafius.
H. R. 2696. Mary E. Dell.
H. R. 2697. Mary A. Smith.
H. R. 2698. Julia Diefenbacher.
H. R. 2699. Hannah Eckard.
H. R. 2700. Sarah Slick.
H. R. 2702. Rachel E. Heuston.
H. R. 2703. Mary F. Nicholson.
H. R. 2704. Rebecca Crofts.
H. R. 2705. Susan Nevitt.
H. R. 2706. Clara A. Smyers.
H. R. 2707. Malinda Vallance.
H. R. 2709. Sarah Baird.
H. R. 2710. Eliza J. Lower.
H. R. 2711. Alice Kiser.
H. R. 2714. Elizabeth Blackstone.
H. R. 2715. Anna M. Burchfield.
H. R. 2716. Mary Cameron.
H. R. 2717. Catharine S. Lloyd.
H. R. 2718. Fannie S. Gibboney.
H. R. 2719. Mary E. Gifford.
H. R. 2721. Emma Akers.
H. R. 2723. Sarah Over.
H. R. 2724. Mary C. Ellenberger.
H. R. 2725. Martha Palmer.
H. R. 2726. Laura Painter.
H. R. 2727. Juniata E. S. Pollard.
H. R. 2728. Sarah E. Moon.
H. R. 2730. Jennie E. Mosser.
H. R. 2731. Elizabeth A. Lytle.
H. R. 2732. Annie M. Miller.
H. R. 2733. Martha E. Corbin.
H. R. 2734. Harriet E. Hunt.
H. R. 2735. Sarah R. White.
H. R. 2737. Agnes A. C. Mahoney.
H. R. 2738. Anna Maria Stephens.
H. R. 2739. Anna M. Ross.
H. R. 2740. Annie E. Harrison.
H. R. 2741. Mary W. Sarvis.
H. R. 2743. Emma Hill.
H. R. 2744. Amanda J. Harvey.
H. R. 2745. Lillie D. Hartley.
H. R. 2746. Annie M. Lucas.
H. R. 2747. Ann E. Kissinger.
H. R. 2748. Mary C. Swisher.
H. R. 2750. Susannah Horton.
H. R. 2751. Hannah B. Irwin.
H. R. 2752. Mary C. Sparks.
H. R. 2753. Helen McCord.
H. R. 2755. Anna E. Hains.
H. R. 2757. Susan Hamilton.
H. R. 2758. Lucinda Hainley.
H. R. 2759. Mary List.
H. R. 2760. Martha J. Burkett.
H. R. 2761. Susannah M. Lynn.
H. R. 2763. Rebecca Horn.
H. R. 2764. Catharine Turnbaugh.
H. R. 2766. Annie I. Latherow.
H. R. 2767. Mary E. Lindley.
H. R. 2768. Bertha H. Lafner.
H. R. 2769. Sarah E. Bruner.
H. R. 2770. Leah D. Barger.
H. R. 2771. Catharine Lehman.
H. R. 2772. Alice Plunket.
H. R. 2773. Mary E. Feay.
H. R. 2776. Mary I. Gracey.
H. R. 2777. Sarah J. Rhodes.
H. R. 2778. Bettie S. Satterfield.
H. R. 2781. Lizzie S. Hight.
H. R. 2782. Eliza A. Rosebury.
H. R. 2783. Laura V. Perdew.
H. R. 2784. Hannah C. Foor.
H. R. 2786. Margaret E. Boyer.
H. R. 2789. Frances C. Mechen.
H. R. 2790. Emma J. Mills.
H. R. 2792. Hannah O. Cooper.
H. R. 2793. Elizabeth Hausman.
H. R. 2794. Mary M. Clossin.
H. R. 2804. Alice J. Selden.
H. R. 2814. Catherine Dorr.
H. R. 2824. Frederike Jones.
H. R. 2825. Amelia A. Green.
H. R. 2827. Margaret Schmall.
H. R. 2829. Amanda Phillips.
H. R. 2831. Priscilla A. Pinney.
H. R. 2832. Pauline Murray.
H. R. 2833. Bridget Marshall.
H. R. 2834. Augusta Engelhardt.
H. R. 2835. Mary Corcoran.
H. R. 2840. Sarah C. Heriford.
H. R. 2849. Margaret F. Morris.
H. R. 2860. Mattie R. Way.
H. R. 2861. Mary A. Tullis.
H. R. 2863. Maggie Stookesberry.
H. R. 2864. Lydia Smith.
H. R. 2869. Mary Nicholson.
H. R. 2871. Susan A. Morgan.
H. R. 2875. Sarah J. Kelley.
H. R. 2891. Frances E. Bolan.
H. R. 2892. Catherine M. Brown.
H. R. 2893. Nellie L. Burns.
H. R. 2895. Carrie E. Colcord.
H. R. 2897. Della J. Dearborn.
H. R. 2898. Augusta M. Dolloff.
H. R. 2902. Mary A. Flye.
H. R. 2903. Lucy R. Hall.
H. R. 2904. Alice M. Hassell.
H. R. 2905. Florence M. Jewell.
H. R. 2906. Hannah M. Juddins.
H. R. 2907. Annie F. Kirkwood.
H. R. 2908. Emma J. Lent.
H. R. 2909. Jennie E. Litchfield.
H. R. 2910. Lizzie Meader.
H. R. 2911. Harriet M. Moore.
H. R. 2912. Lottie L. Noble.
H. R. 2913. Emma G. Morse.
H. R. 2917. Alice M. Spaulding.
H. R. 2918. Rose A. Stacy.
H. R. 2919. Emma P. Stephenson.
H. R. 2922. Harriet J. Sturdy.
H. R. 2923. Annette B. Thorne.
H. R. 2924. Celina Wedge.
H. R. 2925. Mary L. Whitcomb.
H. R. 2927. Alice M. Whitten.
H. R. 2928. Flora Williams.
H. R. 2930. Louise M. Wood.
H. R. 2942. Sarah C. Warthen.
H. R. 2952. Mary F. Osmun.
H. R. 2963. Elvina C. Eberhard.
H. R. 2969. Hannah Sutton.
H. R. 2970. Sarah M. York.
H. R. 2975. Elizabeth Inman.
H. R. 2978. Emeliza Barnhill.
H. R. 2979. Mary A. Bartley.
H. R. 2980. Rachel Belcher.
H. R. 2982. Elizabeth Burket.
H. R. 2983. Celia J. Cromer.
H. R. 2993. Rebecca J. Richmond.
H. R. 3003. Margaret J. Davis.
H. R. 3004. Rebecca Peace.
H. R. 3005. Mary A. Reeder.
H. R. 3012. Sarah E. Hargrave.
H. R. 3016. Sarah M. Mead.
H. R. 3017. Elizabeth Morrow.
H. R. 3018. Susan M. Burton.
H. R. 3019. Mary J. Cochran.
H. R. 3020. Sarah J. Pool.
H. R. 3022. Martha L. Petet.
H. R. 3023. Nancy V. Taylor.
H. R. 3024. Victoria E. Jacox.
H. R. 3025. Susan A. Hays.
H. R. 3028. Matilda J. Kellar.
H. R. 3029. Frances E. Harris.
H. R. 3034. Mary McKendree.
H. R. 3055. Margaret T. McLaughlin.
H. R. 3056. Lydia E. Martin.
H. R. 3057. Adaline Neff.
H. R. 3058. Catharine Pollock.
H. R. 3060. Isabella Speedy.
H. R. 3061. Jennie E. Trullitt.
H. R. 3076. Sarah L. Basore.
H. R. 3077. Susan E. A. De Witt.
H. R. 3078. Clara Elizabeth LeForge.
H. R. 3079. Mary E. Williams.
H. R. 3088. Adaline A. Lawyer.
H. R. 3093. Jennie McCrady.
H. R. 3100. Mary H. Sharp.
H. R. 3115. Mary E. Vore.
H. R. 3128. Amelia Harvey.
H. R. 3131. Esther Shear.
H. R. 3133. Mary D. McCracken.
H. R. 3137. Charlotte Goodman.
H. R. 3140. Adelia A. Davidson.
H. R. 3141. Lucinda M. Lippy.
H. R. 3142. Almida D. Warhurst.
H. R. 3151. Anna Maria Jacobs.
H. R. 3152. Mary A. Koch.
H. R. 3158. Johanna C. Clark.
H. R. 3172. Nancy A. Blakely.
H. R. 3173. Isabella M. Mehaffie.
H. R. 3174. Clotilda Snyder.
H. R. 3177. Caroline E. Girrel.
H. R. 3182. Mary Martin.
H. R. 3185. Anna M. Miller.
H. R. 3186. Alice A. Robb.
H. R. 3195. Amny L. Le Roy.
H. R. 3196. Mary A. Juengst.
H. R. 3207. Amelia Bauman.
H. R. 3208. Lavina Beatty.
H. R. 3209. Anna C. Broker.
H. R. 3210. Cynthia A. Johnston.
H. R. 3212. Elizabeth C. Wayne.
H. R. 3213. Permelia Mackey.
H. R. 3234. Clara E. Slaven.
H. R. 3235. Adell I. McKelvey Young.
H. R. 3236. Mary E. Eckert.
H. R. 3237. Mary J. White.
H. R. 3258. Jane L. Terbush.
H. R. 3276. Rose M. Green.
H. R. 3288. Clara G. Burtis.
H. R. 3289. Cynthia E. Dillard.
H. R. 3291. Theodosia Hammond.
H. R. 3294. Amanda L. Larabee.
H. R. 3297. Hattie M. Pay.
H. R. 3298. Anna E. Stucker.
H. R. 3300. Nancy E. Smith.
H. R. 3301. Ida S. Beauchamp.
H. R. 3302. Sarah E. Branson.
H. R. 3303. Ritty A. Davis.
H. R. 3305. Lumira Decker.
H. R. 3306. Margaret J. Greek.
H. R. 3307. Mary E. Grotts.
H. R. 3308. Emma A. Gustin.
H. R. 3309. Mary C. Owens.
H. R. 3310. Abbeline Mathis.
H. R. 3311. Louisa J. Skidmore.
H. R. 3313. Sarah A. Stiles.
H. R. 3314. Mary E. Wey.
H. R. 3317. Prudence M. Grover.
H. R. 3319. Emma M. Hescok.
H. R. 3320. Sarah Simpson.
H. R. 3322. Nora I. Phelps.
H. R. 3323. Harriet A. Pratt.
H. R. 3325. Florence R. Shufelt.
H. R. 3329. Julia Roberts.
H. R. 3330. Henrietta V. Dale.
H. R. 3332. Jennie E. White.
H. R. 3333. Ellen H. Gile.
H. R. 3334. Eliza A. Sprague.
H. R. 3335. Gertrude G. Hunt.
H. R. 3337. Juliette Sturges.
H. R. 3345. Elizabeth M. Fox.
H. R. 3346. Ann Stevens.
H. R. 3349. Flora I. Eggleston.
H. R. 3350. Myra Marshall.
H. R. 3371. Susan M. Lysinger.
H. R. 3385. Martha E. Devore.
H. R. 3386. Anna E. Clark.
H. R. 3407. Sarah A. Gill.
H. R. 3410. Margarite Scholand.
H. R. 3412. Frances E. Whisker.
H. R. 3414. Matilda A. Eccles.
H. R. 3415. Martha Witman.
H. R. 3427. Catharine T. M. Bachman.
H. R. 3437. Martha Spraker.
H. R. 3438. Mary A. Houghton.
H. R. 3448. Rachel A. Shatto.
H. R. 3450. Mary E. Graham.
H. R. 3468. Kate V. Scheyer.
H. R. 3469. Alice Stebbins.
H. R. 3474. Sarah Harris.
H. R. 3477. Mary A. Hoffman.
H. R. 3478. Mary McCurdy.
H. R. 3479. Caroline Roth.
H. R. 3483. Susan B. Chapman.
H. R. 3485. Laura A. Chapman.
H. R. 3486. Rebecca B. Lewis.
H. R. 3489. Achsah E. Purinton.
H. R. 3490. Lucy E. Reynolds.
H. R. 3491. Jennie M. Moore.
H. R. 3492. Hattie G. Lunt.
H. R. 3493. Eva Stump.
H. R. 3504. Eliza F. Mankins.
H. R. 3520. Iona L. Clark.
H. R. 3523. Hattie Zeiler.
H. R. 3529. Mary E. Hall.
H. R. 3571. Mollie S. Henderson.
H. R. 3572. Dorothea Leimenson.
H. R. 3573. Martha M. Medcalf.
H. R. 3574. Catharine Williams.
H. R. 3575. Mary E. Ray.
H. R. 3576. Isabell Critser.
H. R. 3577. Sarah J. Williams.
H. R. 3579. Florence P. Johnson.
H. R. 3580. Katharine Beiling.

H. R. 3581. Celina J. Smith.	H. R. 3881. Margaret York.	H. R. 4429. Mary J. Anderson.	H. R. 4069. Arrena M. Garner.
H. R. 3582. Mary S. Houghland.	H. R. 3885. Chanice A. Dailey.	H. R. 4430. Mary Johnson.	H. R. 4071. Nancy A. Barnett.
H. R. 3583. Sarah E. Weigert.	H. R. 3889. Cecelia E. Hanes.	H. R. 4431. Eliza G. Carr.	H. R. 4075. Jennie Paniska.
H. R. 3585. Kate Lamb.	H. R. 3902. Rosellia Norton.	H. R. 4436. Anna M. Healy.	H. R. 4077. Antonette J. Pethick.
H. R. 3586. Anna Taylor.	H. R. 3905. Marilda A. Watson.	H. R. 4442. Margaret Ludwig.	H. R. 4078. Alice J. Benjamin.
H. R. 3589. Sarah Battle.	H. R. 3906. Catherine Gilkesson.	H. R. 4443. Clara M. Kerr.	H. R. 4079. Annie Wirick.
H. R. 3590. Sarah C. West.	H. R. 3908. Anna Lowe.	H. R. 4455. Ellen Kolb.	H. R. 4080. Margaret A. Chase.
H. R. 3593. Emma Parcell.	H. R. 3909. Daphne R. Irvine.	H. R. 4456. Kate W. McIntyre.	H. R. 4081. Mary Cauningham.
H. R. 3594. Julia Pfeifer.	H. R. 3916. Celicia E. Feaga.	H. R. 4457. Mary McGuire.	H. R. 4082. Abigail Case.
H. R. 3595. Margaret J. Romans.	H. R. 3917. Mary J. Grimes.	H. R. 4459. Annora J. Noble.	H. R. 4083. Eliza A. Moore.
H. R. 3596. Barbara Roesner.	H. R. 3919. Florence V. Gates.	H. R. 4460. Mary E. O'Daniels.	H. R. 4084. Ellen Henderson.
H. R. 3597. Eliza Richeson.	H. R. 3930. Ida M. Spencer.	H. R. 4461. Elizabeth B. Little.	H. R. 4085. Sophia C. Hickok.
H. R. 3598. Anna E. Snyder.	H. R. 3935. Virginia D. Combs.	H. R. 4462. Mary E. McDavitt.	H. R. 4087. Jorgine Nielson.
H. R. 3599. Clara L. Snyder.	H. R. 3957. Theresa S. Doane.	H. R. 4463. Margaret J. Cheeseman.	H. R. 4092. Gorgonia Gaskey.
H. R. 3600. Clara E. Stevens.	H. R. 3977. Elizabeth F. Groht.	H. R. 4464. Virginia Stackhouse.	H. R. 5023. Mary A. McCune Brown.
H. R. 3601. Matilda A. Stevens.	H. R. 3978. Harriette Celler.	H. R. 4465. Mary M. Van Ness.	H. R. 5024. Marge M. Bear.
H. R. 3602. Maggie Stanton.	H. R. 3997. Jennie B. McPherson.	H. R. 4466. Antha Porter.	H. R. 5025. Minnie A. Bennett.
H. R. 3604. Nancy A. Stephens.	H. R. 4017. Agnes R. Goodnow.	H. R. 4467. Julia O'Neil.	H. R. 5026. Mary A. Eyester.
H. R. 3606. Mary Skaggs.	H. R. 4018. Julia Horner.	H. R. 4468. Annie Fox.	H. R. 5027. Luana Hoff.
H. R. 3607. Mary E. Thompson.	H. R. 4020. Annie W. Jarvis.	H. R. 4473. Hannah E. Haines.	H. R. 5030. Ella I. Rodermel.
H. R. 3611. Christiana Tichenor.	H. R. 4021. Elizabeth Jameson.	H. R. 4474. Deborah Gaskill.	H. R. 5043. Evaline Carpenter.
H. R. 3612. Victoria Utley.	H. R. 4022. Hattie A. B. Clary.	H. R. 4475. Ann Eliza Danberry.	H. R. 5044. Anna B. Barrett.
H. R. 3613. Nancy Ulen.	H. R. 4026. Aurelia Gauthier.	H. R. 4476. Mary Abbott.	H. R. 5045. Mary M. Brewer.
H. R. 3616. Parazetta Wilcox.	H. R. 4033. Helen M. Noble.	H. R. 4479. Mary M. Knowles.	H. R. 5046. Martha Rose.
H. R. 3618. Lorinda Wester.	H. R. 4034. Mary K. Slocum.	H. R. 4480. Elizabeth Nutt.	H. R. 5047. Celia Sroufe.
H. R. 3620. Isabel Williams.	H. R. 4037. N. Emeline Harrison.	H. R. 4481. Alice T. Cantwell.	H. R. 5048. Laura R. Markley.
H. R. 3622. Cordella Niehaus.	H. R. 4038. Amanda W. Kegwin.	H. R. 4482. Sarah Henry.	H. R. 5063. Mary E. Berry.
H. R. 3623. Eliza J. Mathews.	H. R. 4039. Mary C. Bishop.	H. R. 4494. Caroline N. Starr.	H. R. 5069. Sarah L. Herrmann.
H. R. 3625. Marla M. Mann.	H. R. 4040. Caroline Williams.	H. R. 4495. Mary E. Carlow.	H. R. 5095. Catharine Tarbert.
H. R. 3627. Frances J. Moore.	H. R. 4041. Mary A. Brayton.	H. R. 4502. Minerva R. Peck.	H. R. 5096. Elizabeth Taylor.
H. R. 3628. Anna M. Kretchmar.	H. R. 4042. Elizabeth W. Perkins.	H. R. 4505. Anna L. Millard.	H. R. 5098. Mary E. Taylor.
H. R. 3629. Katharina Korp.	H. R. 4043. Josephine Baton.	H. R. 4506. Antoinette A. Ripley.	H. R. 5100. Anna M. Schlund.
H. R. 3630. Theodocia Kell.	H. R. 4050. Josephine C. Bishop.	H. R. 4507. Theresa A. Charter.	H. R. 5102. Tillie Shift.
H. R. 3631. Izella E. Kemp.	H. R. 4056. Alice Bosworth.	H. R. 4508. Mary P. Smith.	H. R. 5103. Christine Snyder.
H. R. 3632. Mary A. Jackson.	H. R. 4059. Emma G. Walker.	H. R. 4510. Susan Nevins.	H. R. 5106. Catharine B. Swartz.
H. R. 3633. Emer Jenkins.	H. R. 4063. Alfaretta S. Quimby.	H. R. 4511. Mary Jeanette Stillman.	H. R. 5107. Catharine A. Smith.
H. R. 3635. Nancy A. Henrich.	H. R. 4071. Loretto Roland.	H. R. 4512. Nettie P. Slate.	H. R. 5108. Catharine Snayser.
H. R. 3637. Caroline Heldt.	H. R. 4072. Rose Humphreys.	H. R. 4515. Hannah M. Barlow.	H. R. 5109. Eliza J. Strassbaugh.
H. R. 3640. Lelia Haines.	H. R. 4073. Margaret H. Suydam.	H. R. 4521. Sarah M. McKain.	H. R. 5110. Annie E. Steinhour.
H. R. 3641. Nancy E. Hebb.	H. R. 4133. Hannah E. Pemberton.	H. R. 4530. Susan A. Lautzenheiser.	H. R. 5112. Lucy E. Rockwell.
H. R. 3642. Maria Hille.	H. R. 4145. Annie Vandegrift.	H. R. 4534. Mary Flynn.	H. R. 5114. Emma A. Raffensperger.
H. R. 3645. Anna E. Greenlees.	H. R. 4148. Charlotte Samson.	H. R. 4547. Vinnie Horn.	H. R. 5115. Amanda Rickroad.
H. R. 3646. Virginia Gordon.	H. R. 4154. Mary Ellen Jones.	H. R. 4548. Margaret J. Sickman.	H. R. 5116. Caroline Robinson.
H. R. 3647. Eliza A. Griffin.	H. R. 4155. Amy Ann Wilcox.	H. R. 4550. Mary E. Fisher.	H. R. 5118. Millie C. Plowman.
H. R. 3649. Mary E. Fleming.	H. R. 4162. Clarissa Markham.	H. R. 4557. Clara I. Mullen.	H. R. 5119. Rebecca Poff.
H. R. 3651. Sallie Everly.	H. R. 4190. Meda Ann Andrews.	H. R. 4596. Eva A. Drury.	H. R. 5120. Emma J. Poleman.
H. R. 3653. America A. Donaldson.	H. R. 4191. Mary E. Williams.	H. R. 4597. Laura H. Marshall.	H. R. 5121. Emma Noel.
H. R. 3657. Alice Bishop.	H. R. 4192. Olive H. Woods.	H. R. 4628. Sarah J. Earl.	H. R. 5123. Mercy K. Monroe.
H. R. 3658. Minnie Behagg.	H. R. 4194. Mary E. De Groat.	H. R. 4630. Lavinia Engler.	H. R. 5125. Margaret N. McAllister.
H. R. 3660. Euphemia Beasley.	H. R. 4195. Mary M. Tappana.	H. R. 4632. Mary L. Beardsley.	H. R. 5127. Mary J. Markley.
H. R. 3662. Mary E. Anderson.	H. R. 4208. Ina Rathbun.	H. R. 4633. Francis M. Cook.	H. R. 5129. Emeline Malchorn.
H. R. 3663. Margaret E. Bates.	H. R. 4220. Julia A. Frazier.	H. R. 4636. Margaret A. Hewitt.	H. R. 5130. Isabella Lauck.
H. R. 3666. Kate Zehler.	H. R. 4227. Mary E. Dailey.	H. R. 4639. Caroline E. Wright.	H. R. 5131. Josephine Lapham.
H. R. 3669. Cinda A. Ruggles.	H. R. 4230. Sarah E. Huffine.	H. R. 4643. Rebecca A. Thomas.	H. R. 5132. Anne E. Liggit.
H. R. 3700. Maud Slesley Boyd.	H. R. 4238. Mary Jones.	H. R. 4646. Mary J. Bunker.	H. R. 5133. Amanda E. King.
H. R. 3702. Julia Hackney.	H. R. 4239. Eliza A. Freeman.	H. R. 4647. Jennie L. Ryon.	H. R. 5134. Elizabeth Kramer.
H. R. 3703. Carrie Hosack.	H. R. 4242. Mary J. Ramsdell.	H. R. 4674. Mattie N. Wood.	H. R. 5136. Sarah J. Hgenfritz.
H. R. 3706. Florence C. Moor.	H. R. 4248. Lydia Breard.	H. R. 4676. Sarah A. Peterson.	H. R. 5137. Sarah C. Hikes.
H. R. 3708. Agnes A. Perry.	H. R. 4249. Charlotte Underwood.	H. R. 4678. Rosa B. Sloop.	H. R. 5138. Mary Gardner.
H. R. 3711. Dorothea C. Wicke.	H. R. 4251. Vianna R. Densmore.	H. R. 4690. Martha Magle.	H. R. 5139. Adaline R. Elcock.
H. R. 3713. Sarah E. Scott.	H. R. 4252. Ellen M. Winn.	H. R. 4695. Elizabeth Spear.	H. R. 5141. Eliza J. Drawbaugh.
H. R. 3715. Ernestine Roberts.	H. R. 4253. Ellen M. Burt.	H. R. 4710. Rachel States.	H. R. 5142. Catherine D. Davis.
H. R. 3734. Catherine M. Smith.	H. R. 4254. Harriet L. Mero.	H. R. 4716. Augusta Northcutt.	H. R. 5143. Mary Dorsey.
H. R. 3735. Mary J. Sheets.	H. R. 4255. Abbie J. Phelps.	H. R. 4717. Maggie Morris.	H. R. 5144. Rebecca Henry.
H. R. 3736. Margaret Vanvierah.	H. R. 4259. Mary E. Smith.	H. R. 4718. Maud Hanna.	H. R. 5146. Sarah C. Henze.
H. R. 3747. Henrietta Cope.	H. R. 4272. Mina Rinck.	H. R. 4719. Elizabeth Wycuff.	H. R. 5147. Sarah J. Hartman.
H. R. 3748. Jennie Roark.	H. R. 4273. Hannah Alstrum.	H. R. 4720. Emma L. Bragg.	H. R. 5148. Susan Horting.
H. R. 3752. Mary C. Campbell.	H. R. 4274. Sarah Weldie.	H. R. 4724. Amanda J. Worrell.	H. R. 5149. Maggie A. Hughes.
H. R. 3754. Mamie Halley.	H. R. 4275. Martha E. Rolff.	H. R. 4725. Elizabeth Walters.	H. R. 5151. Mary J. Har.
H. R. 3766. Julianna Bouchard.	H. R. 4276. Laura H. Day.	H. R. 4728. Martha Witt.	H. R. 5153. Laura V. Eicholtz.
H. R. 3768. Jennie A. Clifford.	H. R. 4277. Mary E. Robinson.	H. R. 4730. Mary B. Peterson.	H. R. 5154. M. Lizzie Everhart.
H. R. 3769. Hannah M. Baker.	H. R. 4278. Mary E. Condray.	H. R. 4731. Effie Washington.	H. R. 5156. Agnes M. Dinsmore.
H. R. 3771. Jennie Barclay.	H. R. 4279. Oille E. Carnaghan.	H. R. 4733. Caroline L. Winter.	H. R. 5158. Anna M. Dellinger.
H. R. 3772. Mary J. Beamer.	H. R. 4282. Elizabeth Walton.	H. R. 4736. Carrie A. Mendenhall.	H. R. 5159. Genevieve Foreman.
H. R. 3780. Lily Atcheson.	H. R. 4283. Esther J. Smith.	H. R. 4737. Nancy Jane Snodgrass.	H. R. 5160. Sarah Hartman.
H. R. 3785. Clara Ziegler.	H. R. 4287. Emma M. Richards.	H. R. 4741. Lena Saxton.	H. R. 5161. Emma Wilhelm.
H. R. 3791. Eliza Tillery.	H. R. 4288. Sarah Hannon.	H. R. 4742. Mary Jane Ream.	H. R. 5163. Mary C. Smith.
H. R. 3796. Maria E. Sager.	H. R. 4289. Bridget C. McGinn.	H. R. 4743. Sciota Barry.	H. R. 5165. Annie M. Campbell.
H. R. 3801. Isabel A. Story.	H. R. 4291. Fiana Snyder.	H. R. 4744. Mary E. Beckley.	H. R. 5166. Emily E. Cassell.
H. R. 3805. Rebecca Jane Shaner.	H. R. 4297. Elizabeth M. Snodgrass.	H. R. 4752. Sue E. Doner.	H. R. 5167. Ann Jane Burton.
H. R. 3807. Euphemia J. Smith.	H. R. 4301. Julia A. McCluskey.	H. R. 4753. Elizabeth M. Patton.	H. R. 5169. Sarah M. Basey.
H. R. 3809. Gertrude Schachte.	H. R. 4304. Nettie A. Packard.	H. R. 4756. Margaret A. Hargrave.	H. R. 5170. Martha E. Biesacker.
H. R. 3810. Margaret R. Rorabaugh.	H. R. 4306. Mary E. Tucker.	H. R. 4757. Emma L. Thomson.	H. R. 5171. Catharine Baughman.
H. R. 3812. Mary Jane Ressler.	H. R. 4309. Mary J. Curtin.	H. R. 4760. Anna E. Dixon.	H. R. 5172. Susy A. Anderson.
H. R. 3817. Mary G. Neighly.	H. R. 4318. Mary J. Cupp.	H. R. 4780. Harriet S. Johnson.	H. R. 5174. Annie Hoover.
H. R. 3818. Rachel R. Mitchell.	H. R. 4319. Margaret Hursey.	H. R. 4792. Annie Bricker.	H. R. 5175. Sarah M. Harbolt.
H. R. 3820. Sarah J. Mock.	H. R. 4320. Mira O. McFarland.	H. R. 4793. Almira M. Taylor.	H. R. 5177. Catharine Fry.
H. R. 3822. Eliza R. McCauley.	H. R. 4321. Mary E. Rowe.	H. R. 4794. Sarah E. Butler.	H. R. 5178. Anna M. Bailey.
H. R. 3823. Mary F. McNelly.	H. R. 4322. Abia McIntosh.	H. R. 4801. Annie Warren.	H. R. 5179. Margaret M. Burger.
H. R. 3824. Mary C. McElwee.	H. R. 4323. Frances C. Gaskill.	H. R. 4803. Ella Hardin.	H. R. 5180. Margaret E. Black.
H. R. 3825. Caroline Lutz.	H. R. 4324. Sedona Beezley.	H. R. 4804. Susan J. Swigert.	H. R. 5181. Mary E. Dasher.
H. R. 3828. Mary Leffler.	H. R. 4326. Elizabeth J. Graham.	H. R. 4829. Janie R. Stewart.	H. R. 5183. Maria A. Beitzel.
H. R. 3832. Rebecca Hill.	H. R. 4329. Charlotte E. Fitch.	H. R. 4842. Martha Jane Sutton.	H. R. 5184. Emma Chenoweth.
H. R. 3835. Rachel E. Henry.	H. R. 4331. Maria A. Sanders.	H. R. 4850. Annie L. Converse.	H. R. 5185. Margaret Rebel.
H. R. 3836. Clarissa Good.	H. R. 4337. Alzira Smithers.	H. R. 4857. Elizabeth Martin.	H. R. 5186. Sarah A. Clingan.
H. R. 3838. Annie Glunt.	H. R. 4339. Sarah Williams.	H. R. 4862. M. Jennie Hull.	H. R. 5187. Sarah A. Douse.
H. R. 3841. Mary L. Deemer.	H. R. 4341. Nancy Ridgway.	H. R. 4903. Mary Rogier.	H. R. 5189. Mary J. Hake.
H. R. 3842. Jane Rannebarger.	H. R. 4343. Marsolote Caskey.	H. R. 4905. Alice Eckert.	H. R. 5192. Maggie Sponsler.
H. R. 3843. Matilda Archer.	H. R. 4345. Minerva J. Triplett.	H. R. 4906. Elvira Louisa Kanady.	H. R. 5193. Mary Shewell.
H. R. 3845. Susan J. Howard.	H. R. 4370. Elizabeth Saunders.	H. R. 4907. Mary A. Bottorff.	H. R. 5194. Ellen A. McCleary.
H. R. 3846. Mary J. Biles.	H. R. 4371. Mary Jane Fasmer.	H. R. 4908. Julia E. Leming.	H. R. 5195. Margaret Knudsen.
H. R. 3847. America Pilchard.	H. R. 4372. Anna W. Hawk.	H. R. 4910. Sarah M. Clegg.	H. R. 5197. Alice Stevens.
H. R. 3849. Mary E. Thompson.	H. R. 4375. Annie C. Brown.	H. R. 4911. Nancy E. Wyant.	H. R. 5198. Mary L. Olmstead.
H. R. 3851. Elvira J. Bartley.	H. R. 4386. Jennie Charlton.	H. R. 4912. Caroline Batch.	H. R. 5208. Ann Browning.
H. R. 3853. Harriet C. Bruce.	H. R. 4401. Sarah J. Baker.	H. R. 4913. Susan Waller.	H. R. 5209. Clara M. Prentice.
H. R. 3855. Sarah A. Dinnel.	H. R. 4402. Mary E. Nighswander.	H. R. 4914. Sarah E. Reck.	H. R. 5212. Maggie E. Wake.
H. R. 3856. Susan F. Collensworth.	H. R. 4403. Harriet A. Decker.	H. R. 4915. Sarah J. Adkins.	H. R. 5239. Eliza Brake.
H. R. 3857. Jane Timmons.	H. R. 4409. Eliza A. Haywood.	H. R. 4932. Maria J. Barnard.	H. R. 5241. Margaret A. Clark.
H. R. 3858. Lucinda Foerster.	H. R. 4424. Tillie C. Wood.	H. R. 4933. Eva M. Cook.	H. R. 5243. Tabitha E. Van Winkle.
H. R. 3860. Mary J. Goodwin.	H. R. 4425. Mary L. Bennett.	H. R. 4936. Phebe W. Perry.	H. R. 5244. Martha A. Regenhardt.
H. R. 3861. Nancy J. Hardwick.	H. R. 4426. Exie L. Stebbins.	H. R. 4937. Emily Reausoleil.	H. R. 5245. Ella J. Good.
H. R. 3863. Eliza A. Mills.	H. R. 4427. Alice G. Lewis.	H. R. 4938. Mary A. C. Vanderhoop.	H. R. 5246. Kate E. Putnam.
H. R. 3864. Dora Martin.	H. R. 4428. Adelia L. Brown.	H. R. 4968. Adaline Ratlinggourd.	H. R. 5247. Martha P. Simpson.

H. R. 5251. Clara L. Biddleman.	H. R. 6295. Emma A. Larue.	H. R. 7133. Sarah Hayes.	H. R. 7653. Alice Bates.
H. R. 5254. Julia E. Wilson.	H. R. 6298. Curney G. Hill.	H. R. 7135. Leah J. Curtis.	H. R. 7655. Carrie A. Bailey.
H. R. 5259. Mary M. Mason.	H. R. 6302. Alice Gormley.	H. R. 7136. Anna M. Kromer.	H. R. 7656. Eliza M. Bagley.
H. R. 5260. Alviria Hill.	H. R. 6303. Catherine Doupp.	H. R. 7144. Emily L. Salkeld.	H. R. 7657. Celestia A. Antes.
H. R. 5276. Eliza B. Miller.	H. R. 6305. Emma Davis.	H. R. 7145. Hester Pollard.	H. R. 7660. Maria E. Blossom.
H. R. 5278. Mary C. Smith.	H. R. 6306. Mary A. Dailey.	H. R. 7146. Lucy Schoonmaker.	H. R. 7661. Mary A. Ackley.
H. R. 5279. Mary C. Pierce.	H. R. 6308. Jerusha H. Chase.	H. R. 7147. Fidelin Breccette.	H. R. 7662. Cora E. Stuart.
H. R. 5281. Frances J. Nettleship.	H. R. 6309. Margaret Belt.	H. R. 7154. Hermina A. Sturm.	H. R. 7665. Catherine B. Wilson.
H. R. 5282. Laura F. Carter.	H. R. 6314. Emma M. Alexander.	H. R. 7164. Marjetta A. Good-enough.	H. R. 7666. Susan A. Ray.
H. R. 5302. Mahala Pugh.	H. R. 6316. Mary E. Wright.	H. R. 7165. Sophia A. Brassfield.	H. R. 7668. Anna L. Richardson.
H. R. 5332. Ida M. Bull.	H. R. 6319. Mary J. Williams.	H. R. 7237. Cynthia B. Lackey.	H. R. 7669. Margaret Sanford.
H. R. 5334. Eva M. Tobin.	H. R. 6324. Jennie Stephens.	H. R. 7252. Laura Jones.	H. R. 7670. Harriet A. Sarlis.
H. R. 5349. Emma Byers.	H. R. 6325. Sophia Slick.	H. R. 7263. Jennie Guy.	H. R. 7672. Eliza A. Shepard.
H. R. 5350. Ellen C. Fuller.	H. R. 6328. Sarah E. Robinson.	H. R. 7264. Charlotte Edick.	H. R. 7677. Mary Strong.
H. R. 5351. Maria Jane Garrett.	H. R. 6333. Anna Adella Butler.	H. R. 7270. Caroline Satter.	H. R. 7678. Emma J. Swartwood.
H. R. 5352. Mary E. Howell.	H. R. 6335. Mary Hiller.	H. R. 7273. Lois Cramton.	H. R. 7679. Julia E. Taylor.
H. R. 5353. Hannah C. Bunch.	H. R. 6354. Melvina Osborn.	H. R. 7274. Mary J. Heaney.	H. R. 7680. Anna Tharp.
H. R. 5356. Walburga Fassnacht.	H. R. 6355. Huldah Leedom.	H. R. 7283. Susan Clark.	H. R. 7681. Erselia Covert.
H. R. 5357. Helen Kennedy.	H. R. 6356. Arriadne Stewart.	H. R. 7292. Mollie Orem.	H. R. 7682. Mary J. Coon.
H. R. 5358. Bridget O'Connor.	H. R. 6359. Ollie T. Miller.	H. R. 7294. Minerva E. Berry.	H. R. 7684. Mertella T. Clark.
H. R. 5360. Isabel W. Siler.	H. R. 6371. Clara Swanson.	H. R. 7295. Lucy A. Blakeley.	H. R. 7685. Ida B. Chesebrough.
H. R. 5361. Lucy Rush.	H. R. 6384. Nancy A. Dixon.	H. R. 7296. Mary E. Browning.	H. R. 7686. Addie Champion.
H. R. 5362. Sophia C. Harrington.	H. R. 6386. Nancy Jesse.	H. R. 7297. Katharine K. Collins.	H. R. 7687. Emeline L. Carr.
H. R. 5363. Laura Comingore.	H. R. 6387. Caroline Pasley.	H. R. 7298. Mary E. Fountain.	H. R. 7688. Emily F. Carey.
H. R. 5364. Mary S. McLean.	H. R. 6390. Rebecca McDowell.	H. R. 7300. Helen D. Jenkins.	H. R. 7689. Mary L. Campbell.
H. R. 5367. Martha R. Wilcoxan.	H. R. 6403. Johanna L. Blish.	H. R. 7302. Sarah J. Joslin.	H. R. 7690. Caroline S. Byam.
H. R. 5368. Elizabeth H. Crigler.	H. R. 6407. Margaret Crelley.	H. R. 7304. Jennie McQueen.	H. R. 7691. Orinda L. Burdick.
H. R. 5370. Deborah A. Tolver.	H. R. 6408. Anna E. Doty.	H. R. 7305. Ella Moore.	H. R. 7692. Julia M. Buchanan.
H. R. 5371. Mary N. Zufall.	H. R. 6409. Jennie Page.	H. R. 7306. Hettie Quigley.	H. R. 7693. Mary P. Bruner.
H. R. 5372. Catherine Black.	H. R. 6410. Mary E. Moss.	H. R. 7307. Mary L. Richards.	H. R. 7694. Mary Brown.
H. R. 5374. Sarah F. Huff.	H. R. 6414. Annie Hagan.	H. R. 7308. Elizabeth O. Robertson.	H. R. 7695. Cynthia M. Brown.
H. R. 5375. Charity Ann Utter.	H. R. 6417. Amanda E. Rogers.	H. R. 7310. Cora Young.	H. R. 7698. Harriett E. Beary.
H. R. 5410. Maria P. Flügge.	H. R. 6428. Mary A. Miller.	H. R. 7311. Deliah M. Zenor.	H. R. 7712. Frances J. Denney.
H. R. 5417. Laura O'Dwyer.	H. R. 6433. Mary E. Rogers.	H. R. 7312. Annie M. Robb.	H. R. 7721. Annie L. Williamson.
H. R. 5438. Virginia Morris.	H. R. 6434. Lucinda Martin.	H. R. 7314. Sarah A. Welshmyer.	H. R. 7760. Ruth Cooley.
H. R. 5443. Martha E. Butt.	H. R. 6435. Minnie W. Hurlburt.	H. R. 7317. Anna J. Cochran.	H. R. 7762. Maria Smith.
H. R. 5444. Annie A. Little.	H. R. 6437. Mary A. Lewis.	H. R. 7321. Josephine Thompson.	H. R. 7763. Henrietta C. Dodge.
H. R. 5445. Susan V. Cornell.	H. R. 6444. Catharine Flori.	H. R. 7323. Martha A. Hodges.	H. R. 7765. Julia Burkart.
H. R. 5447. Mary Smith.	H. R. 6450. Elizabeth Jane Borlin.	H. R. 7377. Nannie J. Heinbach.	H. R. 7768. Ethel L. Williams.
H. R. 5448. Scottie E. Scofield.	H. R. 6457. Josephine Wallace.	H. R. 7380. Carrie E. Viney.	H. R. 7776. Mary Trouts.
H. R. 5449. Anna H. Humbertson.	H. R. 6533. Sarah A. Showalter.	H. R. 7381. Permelia Miller.	H. R. 7783. Annie M. Barnhart.
H. R. 5452. Martha Cherry.	H. R. 6535. Ivey R. Wood.	H. R. 7407. Elizabeth F. Belles.	H. R. 7788. Alice J. Williams.
H. R. 5453. Catherine McDermitt.	H. R. 6536. Mary Keen.	H. R. 7413. Catharine Wood.	H. R. 7790. Matilda M. Bear.
H. R. 5454. Laney M. Darkey.	H. R. 6540. Mary A. Salsbury.	H. R. 7414. Nancy E. Carrington.	H. R. 7792. Elizabeth Jones.
H. R. 5455. Sarah C. Shilt.	H. R. 6553. Nancy E. Baker.	H. R. 7422. Alice Van Every.	H. R. 7793. Susan M. Kyle.
H. R. 5457. Nancy E. Norris.	H. R. 6556. Mary J. Hunter.	H. R. 7423. Lucinda J. Hanna.	H. R. 7804. Lucinda C. Jacobs.
H. R. 5458. Catharine Sunburg.	H. R. 6561. Harriette Marsh.	H. R. 7427. Emily Mapes.	H. R. 7805. Martha J. Ingie.
H. R. 5461. Margaret B. Parker.	H. R. 6570. Mary A. Miller.	H. R. 7429. Mary J. Pettit.	H. R. 7806. Jadna Coward.
H. R. 5463. Sarah J. Ramsey.	H. R. 6582. Eliza Ann Bottom.	H. R. 7432. Jennie L. Storms.	H. R. 7811. Lucy E. Russell.
H. R. 5476. Margaret Haney.	H. R. 6584. Helena Hasenstab.	H. R. 7440. Isabella Knapp.	H. R. 7816. Huldaj Sanders.
H. R. 5478. Mary Stafford.	H. R. 6586. Sarah E. M. Miller.	H. R. 7441. Louisa H. Iland.	H. R. 7822. Mary A. Smith.
H. R. 5480. Eliza A. Sears.	H. R. 6587. Prissilla Storms.	H. R. 7442. Sarah E. Hampton.	H. R. 7826. Hattie Max.
H. R. 5481. Della Satterly.	H. R. 6589. Sarah A. Royer.	H. R. 7444. Frances Heath.	H. R. 7829. Jennie L. Russell.
H. R. 5482. Harriet J. Gaylord.	H. R. 6600. Lillie S. Armsted.	H. R. 7446. Jane Cooper.	H. R. 7834. Alice Spence.
H. R. 5483. Julia Cramer.	H. R. 6605. Nannie R. Harrison.	H. R. 7482. Margaret Burris.	H. R. 7835. Rosa E. Postel.
H. R. 5484. Lydia J. Marchand.	H. R. 6607. Annie H. Hooper.	H. R. 7498. Bettie A. Baldwin.	H. R. 7843. Mary DeVos.
H. R. 5486. Harriet Wentz.	H. R. 6608. Mabel Wright.	H. R. 7499. Addie C. Page.	H. R. 7846. Margaret Cansler.
H. R. 5488. Catherine Fitzpatrick.	H. R. 6609. Harriet B. Bolser.	H. R. 7501. Mary E. Hertzler.	H. R. 7847. Mary A. Reiber.
H. R. 5489. Lillian E. Zoller.	H. R. 6611. Laura M. Ellis.	H. R. 7502. Margaretta Gloss.	H. R. 7853. Phebe Hills.
H. R. 5491. Lorena Wample.	H. R. 6615. Susan M. Hill.	H. R. 7507. Ida E. Fisher.	H. R. 7854. Katie McDonald.
H. R. 5492. Rosetta Cleveland.	H. R. 6620. Nancy C. Vanhooose.	H. R. 7515. Almira Gill.	H. R. 7857. Mary J. Vernatter.
H. R. 5493. Sarah J. M. Cotton.	H. R. 6625. Annie Perkins.	H. R. 7528. Frances J. Jackson.	H. R. 7858. Lelia E. Brunker.
H. R. 5498. Mary F. Raymond.	H. R. 6627. Elizabeth J. Smith.	H. R. 7536. Jeanette P. Merchant.	H. R. 7862. Sarah E. Taylor.
H. R. 5511. Malinda Winslip.	H. R. 6628. Mary A. Howard.	H. R. 7537. Cansady McDonald.	H. R. 7864. Eliza Tinkham.
H. R. 5524. Jennie E. Daugherty.	H. R. 6632. Sarah A. Briggs.	H. R. 7543. Susanna List.	H. R. 7865. Matilda F. Axline.
H. R. 5536. Mary A. Reed.	H. R. 6635. Temperance Whittman.	H. R. 7544. Louisa E. Miller.	H. R. 7867. Sarah A. Gormley.
H. R. 5537. Maria Austin.	H. R. 6636. Ella Koppisch.	H. R. 7563. Emma L. Putnam.	H. R. 7868. Julia Norris.
H. R. 5559. Annie E. Slawson.	H. R. 6725. Mary Hahn.	H. R. 7564. Carrie P. Prentice.	H. R. 7870. Emma McCameron.
H. R. 5562. Sarah F. Garrison.	H. R. 6726. Catharine L. Foote.	H. R. 7566. Margaret A. Peterson.	H. R. 7872. Sarah E. Wallace.
H. R. 5563. Mary Chilson.	H. R. 6729. Sarah E. Sutton.	H. R. 7569. Alida Parkhill.	H. R. 7873. Emma J. Field.
H. R. 5565. Della A. Lillerbridge.	H. R. 6769. Johanna E. Mouser.	H. R. 7570. Amelia Orr.	H. R. 7876. Josie Martin.
H. R. 5579. Mabel L. Shumway.	H. R. 6772. Nellie B. Paddock.	H. R. 7571. Louisa B. Newcomb.	H. R. 7877. Mary E. Cooley.
H. R. 5591. Elvira A. Hale.	H. R. 6784. Anna M. Hacks.	H. R. 7572. Emma E. Nelson.	H. R. 7879. Esther M. Bunn.
H. R. 5597. Cynthia A. Monroe.	H. R. 6785. Margaret A. Dively.	H. R. 7574. Sophronia A. Mettler.	H. R. 7880. Maggie A. Shephard.
H. R. 5598. Susan Hill.	H. R. 6800. Magdalena C. Beck.	H. R. 7575. Jessie McManus.	H. R. 7881. Johanna P. Miller.
H. R. 6000. Emma G. Heffner.	H. R. 6808. Rhoda I. Woodruff.	H. R. 7576. Jennie McGovern.	H. R. 7886. Rachel Berkshire.
H. R. 6013. Gertrude Cissell.	H. R. 6809. Sarah A. Kelley.	H. R. 7582. M. Frank Lentz.	H. R. 7956. Henrietta Sumpter.
H. R. 6014. Sarah E. Adams.	H. R. 6812. Litia Mills.	H. R. 7584. Mary Landon.	H. R. 7957. Elizabeth Sarah Taggart.
H. R. 6111. Louisa Roberts.	H. R. 6818. Susan E. Smith.	H. R. 7586. Mary Alida Kilpatrick.	H. R. 7968. Matilda Lovey.
H. R. 6131. Sarah J. Hanna.	H. R. 6822. Jane Christian.	H. R. 7587. Lucy M. Kennedy.	H. R. 7991. Susan E. Rodgers.
H. R. 6135. Mattie H. Meise.	H. R. 6825. Celia A. Brown.	H. R. 7590. Catherine E. Keck.	H. R. 7994. Maria Davis.
H. R. 6139. Rachel Kline.	H. R. 6828. Della M. Storie.	H. R. 7591. Isadora Judson.	H. R. 8012. Helen A. Parker.
H. R. 6143. Orill L. Hunter.	H. R. 6831. Mary A. Wenner.	H. R. 7592. Miranda Jenks.	H. R. 8017. Mae E. Garrison.
H. R. 6177. Faustina B. Barton.	H. R. 6834. Mary De Rusha.	H. R. 7593. Diana Tillyer.	H. R. 8021. Frances E. Bowers.
H. R. 6184. Mary B. Bush.	H. R. 6841. Reckel Mydlorsch.	H. R. 7596. Evaline R. Tuton.	H. R. 8032. Abbie R. Raymond.
H. R. 6186. Emma J. Preble.	H. R. 6866. Louisa E. McClinton.	H. R. 7597. Lillian M. Van Housen.	H. R. 8038. Mary Thompson.
H. R. 6187. Lizzie M. Bird.	H. R. 6867. Minnie Fliege.	H. R. 7600. Frances C. Ward.	H. R. 8044. Catharine J. Lynn.
H. R. 6195. Della Ham.	H. R. 6868. Sarah E. Herron.	H. R. 7601. Temperance C. Ward.	H. R. 8049. Kate M. Wagner.
H. R. 6210. Mary J. Kenan.	H. R. 6875. Mary Bruce.	H. R. 7602. Alice D. Washburn.	H. R. 8060. Magdalene Inglebirt.
H. R. 6219. Emma C. Clothier.	H. R. 6880. Ellen Gavin.	H. R. 7604. Elizabeth A. Weeks.	H. R. 8061. Annie Malehorn.
H. R. 6220. Ellen Russell.	H. R. 6882. Mary C. Young.	H. R. 7605. Anna M. Zwilling.	H. R. 8063. Margaret Callahan.
H. R. 6221. Jennie Dooley.	H. R. 6883. Hattie J. Jones.	H. R. 7608. Helen E. Winslip.	H. R. 8065. Margaret Ring.
H. R. 6222. Mary A. Bellows.	H. R. 6886. Mary E. Brubaker.	H. R. 7608. Lillian H. Wood.	H. R. 8067. Martha E. Gear.
H. R. 6225. Clemenza A. Avery.	H. R. 6891. Mary A. Longworth.	H. R. 7609. Amanda A. White.	H. R. 8069. Adaline B. Hopkins.
H. R. 6226. Elizabeth Ginder.	H. R. 6900. Malinda Shroyer.	H. R. 7627. Jennie A. Howard.	H. R. 8083. Elizabeth Geyer.
H. R. 6227. Catharine West.	H. R. 6905. Phebe M. Apgar.	H. R. 7628. Sylvia A. Hollenbeck.	H. R. 8090. Zachariah T. Davenport.
H. R. 6229. Joseph A. Huffman.	H. R. 6915. Charlotte E. Hammitt.	H. R. 7630. Hattie A. Hill.	H. R. 8091. Clara Comer.
H. R. 6230. Mary Whiteleather.	H. R. 6918. Mary Bentley.	H. R. 7635. Emma Furey.	H. R. 8098. Jane C. Godfrey.
H. R. 6231. Harriett Oberlin.	H. R. 6932. Nettie S. Anderson.	H. R. 7636. Eliza J. Freese.	H. R. 8100. Eunice R. Rose.
H. R. 6237. Catharine Newlin.	H. R. 6940. Margret E. Arbun.	H. R. 7637. Susan L. Fero.	H. R. 8103. Lucy McDonnell.
H. R. 6238. Mary E. Bookhammer.	H. R. 6942. Mary Bayette.	H. R. 7638. Sarah Evland.	H. R. 8161. Elizabeth T. Kille.
H. R. 6240. Ruth A. Jenkins.	H. R. 6945. Allie Mitchelltree.	H. R. 7639. Sarah B. Drake.	H. R. 8170. California T. Myers.
H. R. 6241. Mary E. Conwell.	H. R. 6949. Martha Ely.	H. R. 7640. Sarah C. Dixon.	H. R. 8173. Catharine J. Hall.
H. R. 6242. M. Carrie Ellis.	H. R. 6951. Addie H. Gardner.	H. R. 7641. Eunice M. Denmark.	H. R. 8178. Hortense J. George.
H. R. 6243. G. Annie Gregg.	H. R. 7039. Fannie R. Parshley.	H. R. 7642. Margaret A. De Coursey.	H. R. 8177. Malissa F. Stayton.
H. R. 6244. Mary E. Young.	H. R. 7041. Harriet E. Randall.	H. R. 7643. Mary E. Dawson.	H. R. 8182. Emma G. Miller.
H. R. 6252. Nettie Hamill.	H. R. 7047. Mary E. Sutton.	H. R. 7644. Margaret Davis.	H. R. 8184. Mary C. Barnes.
H. R. 6264. Sarah Bell.	H. R. 7073. Cora E. Cox.	H. R. 7645. Sarah E. Cushing.	H. R. 8189. Melissa E. Gaines.
H. R. 6269. Isadora B. Meadows.	H. R. 7074. Elizabeth N. Perry.	H. R. 7649. Lida M. Crane.	H. R. 8191. Sarah J. Bean.
H. R. 6270. Mary J. Corle.	H. R. 7114. Amy Hooper.	H. R. 7651. Prudence Bennett.	H. R. 8196. Ruth E. Barton.
H. R. 6273. William L. Wilson.	H. R. 7115. Jennie A. Ford.	H. R. 7652. Martha J. Bennett.	H. R. 8204. Rebecca Brewer.
H. R. 6285. Jane E. Cave.	H. R. 7117. Rosa Fosnight.		H. R. 8209. Mary E. Walker.
H. R. 6289. Friderike Pille.	H. R. 7119. Elizabeth Swan.		H. R. 8238. Mary M. Renwick.
H. R. 6298. Anna B. Leiter.	H. R. 7128. Belle Stuart.		

H. R. 8244. Hannah Wetherill.	H. R. 8955. Sarah J. Harris.	H. R. 9707. Gertrude Ohmes.	H. R. 10348. Ida F. Saxbury.
H. R. 8246. Martha L. Palmer.	H. R. 8959. Amanda Pope.	H. R. 9717. Sarah A. Fleak.	H. R. 10379. Anna B. Morgan.
H. R. 8247. Ann A. Smith.	H. R. 8979. Susan L. Nichols.	H. R. 9718. Ella Howard.	H. R. 10381. Louise W. Koch.
H. R. 8248. Annie Pecor.	H. R. 8990. Mary J. Mullet.	H. R. 9724. Mary C. Rowe.	H. R. 10388. Etta D. Harrington.
H. R. 8258. Dianna Ricketts.	H. R. 8992. Mary A. Phillips.	H. R. 9727. Sarah J. Jones.	H. R. 10389. Catharine Gooderson.
H. R. 8262. Jennie DuBois.	H. R. 8993. Martha J. Smith.	H. R. 9728. Lizzie Butler.	H. R. 10390. Lucinda Hoon.
H. R. 8263. Annie M. Kelly.	H. R. 8994. Mary E. Dubbs.	H. R. 9738. Ellen B. Lasure.	H. R. 10391. Lucy P. Reagle.
H. R. 8390. Margaret B. Patterson.	H. R. 8997. Lydia A. Robinson.	H. R. 9739. Charilla Harbour.	H. R. 10393. Jennie Appleget.
H. R. 8391. Florence Bratton.	H. R. 9004. Sarah J. Heiser.	H. R. 9742. Fannie Gordon.	H. R. 10395. Jessie Blair.
H. R. 8397. Florence B. Clark.	H. R. 9007. Mary E. Banker.	H. R. 9744. Elizabeth B. Arnold.	H. R. 10396. Hortense Bernardin.
H. R. 8398. Ann E. Worrell.	H. R. 9016. Susan Goble.	H. R. 9752. Sarah Campbell.	H. R. 10400. Louanna Cross.
H. R. 8399. Salina V. Allen.	H. R. 9067. Amelia A. Ellis.	H. R. 9753. Mary O'Neill.	H. R. 10412. Julia Blanchard.
H. R. 8403. Fannie J. B. Kelley.	H. R. 9068. Illinois Christie.	H. R. 9755. Annie E. McFarland.	H. R. 10419. Susan A. Hatcher.
H. R. 8404. Sarah Jane Evans.	H. R. 9069. Christina Meyer.	H. R. 9759. Mary E. Boseley.	H. R. 10448. Jennie A. Raymond.
H. R. 8406. Mary E. Hollopeter.	H. R. 9079. Keturah E. Pierson.	H. R. 9790. Elizabeth Reed.	H. R. 10449. Susan Vaughn.
H. R. 8407. Emma E. Peters.	H. R. 9081. Ellen J. Cartland.	H. R. 9796. Sarah Jane Sherer.	H. R. 10459. Henrietta Stackpole.
H. R. 8408. Mariah T. Howell.	H. R. 9088. Mary A. Hall.	H. R. 9800. Cynthia A. Culver.	H. R. 10460. Eva M. Baker.
H. R. 8416. Philippina Hople.	H. R. 9092. Harriett L. Bowen.	H. R. 9801. Sarah J. Ober.	H. R. 10461. Elvira Young.
H. R. 8418. Emily I. Lacy.	H. R. 9103. Jane A. McDonough.	H. R. 9804. Ida Chilson.	H. R. 10464. Annie E. Stauch.
H. R. 8424. Alice J. Potter.	H. R. 9108. Harriet Knizley.	H. R. 9819. Emma Martin.	H. R. 10465. Annie E. Parks.
H. R. 8427. Maggie L. Burgess.	H. R. 9113. M. Alice Dimmick.	H. R. 9820. Felicia B. Frew.	H. R. 10468. Helen Gibbs.
H. R. 8428. Harriet C. Hay.	H. R. 9116. Diantha Dean.	H. R. 9821. Margaret E. Shaffer.	H. R. 10470. Hattie N. Brown.
H. R. 8429. Catherine Andrews.	H. R. 9122. Sarah E. Hooper.	H. R. 9822. Caroline E. Trumbull.	H. R. 10497. Sarah A. Lovelady.
H. R. 8430. Mary A. Williams.	H. R. 9158. Minnesota Rial.	H. R. 9823. Emaline Sprinker.	H. R. 10504. Elizabeth Evans.
H. R. 8431. Elizabeth Nash.	H. R. 9169. Mary J. Corey.	H. R. 9824. Henrietta Stevenson.	H. R. 10510. Ruth A. Hazard.
H. R. 8435. Hattie Sinclair.	H. R. 9171. Mary E. Faunce.	H. R. 9825. Emma M. Paye.	H. R. 10512. Jennie Porter.
H. R. 8436. Ida L. Clark.	H. R. 9173. Amanda J. Harris.	H. R. 9875. Ellen B. Wurtz.	H. R. 10514. Sylvia S. Felmly.
H. R. 8438. Mary A. Butts.	H. R. 9178. Margaret A. Allison.	H. R. 9876. Mary T. Sturgel.	H. R. 10523. Mary R. Gorham.
H. R. 8448. Elizabeth Hastrich.	H. R. 9179. Susana Place.	H. R. 9877. Emily J. McCollum.	H. R. 10527. Lucetta Hayes.
H. R. 8471. Elizabeth J. Martin.	H. R. 9181. Araminta M. Smith.	H. R. 9882. Ellen Bott.	H. R. 10531. Nancy Wolford.
H. R. 8472. Sarah Sullins.	H. R. 9184. Emily L. Brown.	H. R. 9883. Mary H. Smith.	H. R. 10537. Josephine Sullivan.
H. R. 8476. Florence Bogart.	H. R. 9185. Anna H. Lowry.	H. R. 9885. Emma J. Watts.	H. R. 10571. Isabella C. S. Gilder-sleeve.
H. R. 8494. Dora A. Hart.	H. R. 9216. Mary E. Flegal.	H. R. 9886. Margaret A. Church.	H. R. 10581. Marion G. Webb.
H. R. 8495. Almira Lalone.	H. R. 9232. Wilhelmina H. Schwal-her.	H. R. 9887. Mary A. White.	H. R. 10583. Flora Seymour.
H. R. 8503. Margaret Waugh.	H. R. 9233. Ettie C. Smith.	H. R. 9890. Maria Fluor.	H. R. 10594. Mary E. McCoy.
H. R. 8513. Margaret Lawwill.	H. R. 9234. Margaret Brown.	H. R. 9891. Mary Dailey.	H. R. 10597. Margaret A. Louthan.
H. R. 8520. Jennette Horton.	H. R. 9240. Margaret E. Gunter.	H. R. 9892. Sarah J. Stanbrough.	H. R. 10598. Mary E. Lamb.
H. R. 8573. Emily A. McLeran.	H. R. 9244. Lydia Reese.	H. R. 9904. Elsie E. Tankersley.	H. R. 10607. Callie M. Lyon.
H. R. 8578. Edith Chase.	H. R. 9246. Malinda Stevens.	H. R. 9911. Araminta M. Smith.	H. R. 10610. Ellen V. Heiner.
H. R. 8581. Mary C. Dennis.	H. R. 9253. Bridget D. Boland.	H. R. 9914. Margaret Kane.	H. R. 10612. Elizabeth A. Woodruff.
H. R. 8583. Rebecca E. Lentz.	H. R. 9257. Emeline Isminger.	H. R. 9915. Phoebe C. Austin.	H. R. 10614. Hannah P. M. Dunham.
H. R. 8584. Helen A. E. Witman.	H. R. 9263. Emma J. Mawhirter.	H. R. 9920. Rebecca A. Bonesteel.	H. R. 10630. Basha A. Forshee.
H. R. 8585. Elizabeth A. Bryan.	H. R. 9264. Betsy E. McCaddow.	H. R. 9921. Mary A. Bailey.	H. R. 10632. Julie Friedrich.
H. R. 8586. Mary A. King.	H. R. 9267. Ellen A. Chapell.	H. R. 9923. Eulalie Charbonneault.	H. R. 10634. Hannah C. Roberts.
H. R. 8588. Alice Henry.	H. R. 9268. Sarah Lytle.	H. R. 9925. Margaret Newman.	H. R. 10660. Sarah E. Courter.
H. R. 8592. Hannah A. Harlow.	H. R. 9302. Edgar M. Riggs.	H. R. 9926. Jennie S. Adams.	H. R. 10665. Anna M. Kennedy.
H. R. 8603. Martha Schmelzle.	H. R. 9306. Anna E. Castle.	H. R. 9927. Julia Floyd.	H. R. 10666. Malinda Peiffer.
H. R. 8604. Susan Piggett.	H. R. 9316. Anna M. Drake.	H. R. 9930. Sarah E. Blanchard.	H. R. 10667. Elizabeth Dies.
H. R. 8606. Chloe Wertz.	H. R. 9323. Mary Adams.	H. R. 9931. Sara Campbell.	H. R. 10668. Eldorado Walker.
H. R. 8612. Phoebe Ely.	H. R. 9324. Isabell Wilson.	H. R. 9937. Luscenia Duncan.	H. R. 10669. Matilda Michael.
H. R. 8616. Maria L. Doughty.	H. R. 9327. Nettie C. Talbott.	H. R. 9942. Marietta L. McNair.	H. R. 10670. Nancy E. Miller.
H. R. 8619. Eliza A. Morrison.	H. R. 9328. Catharine Taylor.	H. R. 9969. Mary J. Connour.	H. R. 10682. Nancy R. Eaton.
H. R. 8624. Mary E. Reynolds.	H. R. 9330. Elizabeth Smith.	H. R. 9970. Mary Beaudette.	H. R. 10685. Catharine Myers.
H. R. 8626. Nancy J. Rider.	H. R. 9331. Margaret E. Glenn.	H. R. 9976. Ada E. Dobbins.	H. R. 10686. Gertrude Fisk.
H. R. 8629. Emmer A. Ward.	H. R. 9332. Fidelia A. Gibson.	H. R. 9979. Hettie A. Hendricks.	H. R. 10691. Ella A. Knapp.
H. R. 8634. Sarah E. Clark.	H. R. 9335. Eliza J. Merrill.	H. R. 9983. Caroline Andrew.	H. R. 10692. Rose A. Robinson.
H. R. 8637. Elizabeth Boes.	H. R. 9376. Nancy A. Cook.	H. R. 9985. Nancy Lemons.	H. R. 10693. Clara Alton.
H. R. 8639. Delia Lammers.	H. R. 9393. Caroline Hoffman.	H. R. 9988. Mary B. Wallace.	H. R. 10694. Frances L. Prim.
H. R. 8641. Jessie W. Le Clere.	H. R. 9394. Martha J. Hite.	H. R. 10003. Adaline Whinery.	H. R. 10695. Anna E. Gehrett.
H. R. 8649. Sarah A. Peters.	H. R. 9400. John S. Ashworth.	H. R. 10004. Elizabeth A. Becker.	H. R. 10698. Elizabeth J. Stoner.
H. R. 8653. Alice Rose.	H. R. 9406. Eliza A. Diveley.	H. R. 10007. Anna M. McKain.	H. R. 10699. Anna M. Black.
H. R. 8661. Alice O'Hearn.	H. R. 9410. Marion L. Holvenstot.	H. R. 10011. Mary Ryan.	H. R. 10700. Sarah E. Johnson.
H. R. 8666. Anna M. Frank.	H. R. 9414. Mary A. Glackin.	H. R. 10017. Margaret Davidson.	H. R. 10717. Susan Gentry.
H. R. 8667. Useba McMullen Byers.	H. R. 9415. Elizabeth Gallagher.	H. R. 10029. Catharine Groff.	H. R. 10745. Mary L. Wheeler.
H. R. 8669. Anna Houghtlin.	H. R. 9420. Lottie Hannah.	H. R. 10043. Melissa J. Sprague.	H. R. 10753. Belle M. Jump.
H. R. 8670. Mary Lum.	H. R. 9422. Ellen J. Strain.	H. R. 10047. Dorothy Ott.	H. R. 10772. Sarah M. Armstrong.
H. R. 8675. Nellie L. Hallock.	H. R. 9424. Jane A. Ford.	H. R. 10055. Mary E. Guliver.	H. R. 10779. Susie E. Richards.
H. R. 8676. Lydia J. Goodsell.	H. R. 9425. Harriet B. Gros.	H. R. 10056. Sarah Frances Vibbert.	H. R. 10780. Nancy J. Wager.
H. R. 8677. Maggie M. Horton.	H. R. 9437. Catharine Whitney.	H. R. 10064. Elizabeth W. Harris.	H. R. 10787. Nettie S. Staples.
H. R. 8678. Ann S. Henderson.	H. R. 9445. Dora H. Emmens.	H. R. 10068. Mary A. Dial.	H. R. 10788. Susanna Dakin.
H. R. 8681. Jennie S. Bennett.	H. R. 9447. Emma C. Miller.	H. R. 10094. Jennie R. Jennings.	H. R. 10789. Alice E. Murphy.
H. R. 8684. Sarah Van Tuyl.	H. R. 9448. Emma Miller.	H. R. 10102. Florence J. Chapin.	H. R. 10790. Mary A. Schwartz.
H. R. 8685. Delia L. Maricle.	H. R. 9449. Rachel A. Mickler.	H. R. 10109. Sesurea Rose Therrien.	H. R. 10792. Emma S. Rust.
H. R. 8689. Josie Duval.	H. R. 9450. Martha A. Vroman.	H. R. 10114. Mary Short.	H. R. 10793. Eliza J. Newton.
H. R. 8693. Cinderella I. McCracken.	H. R. 9467. Frederick Smith.	H. R. 10115. Harriet N. Gates.	H. R. 10797. Mary L. Huff.
H. R. 8701. Mary A. Purvis.	H. R. 9469. Elizabeth Guy.	H. R. 10120. Nellie M. Stern.	H. R. 10811. Isophene Ward.
H. R. 8703. Eliza A. Maxfield.	H. R. 9470. Jane Miller.	H. R. 10122. Phyletta Manning.	H. R. 10818. Jennie M. Searle.
H. R. 8705. Rinda Wilson.	H. R. 9474. Ruth L. Terrill.	H. R. 10123. Mary L. Nickloy.	H. R. 10820. Ella Winchester.
H. R. 8706. Sarah J. McDowell.	H. R. 9479. Lisetta Howell.	H. R. 10128. Rachel Clark.	H. R. 10823. Georgianna G. Thayer.
H. R. 8707. Mary Vanover.	H. R. 9506. Mary A. Biggs.	H. R. 10129. Louise E. Van Norden.	H. R. 10831. Bridget Mullins.
H. R. 8756. Elizabeth Dextater.	H. R. 9508. Sarah E. Sennard.	H. R. 10134. Henrietta A. Forbes.	H. R. 10832. Samantha Snider.
H. R. 8759. Martha S. Foster.	H. R. 9514. Elizabeth Hess.	H. R. 10135. Ruth E. Hering.	H. R. 10833. Alice Black.
H. R. 8766. Serena B. Bray.	H. R. 9529. Mary E. Oliver.	H. R. 10175. Huldah Van Cleve.	H. R. 10841. Catherine A. Curran.
H. R. 8777. Rose Murphy.	H. R. 9531. Maria A. Towers.	H. R. 10176. Cornelia B. Atkinson.	H. R. 10844. Sarah Hubbard.
H. R. 8780. Annie M. Burgner.	H. R. 9533. Mary Hollopeter.	H. R. 10177. Miranda Joste.	H. R. 10848. Louisa D. Warriner.
H. R. 8781. Mary E. Horner.	H. R. 9541. Armina J. Orcutt.	H. R. 10203. Hattie McKearnin.	H. R. 10849. Susan F. Winchell.
H. R. 8782. Rosana Keesey.	H. R. 9548. Sarah E. Pearson.	H. R. 10206. Mary A. Odom.	H. R. 10850. Annie C. Walbridge.
H. R. 8792. Mary L. Warrick.	H. R. 9550. Minnie Toner.	H. R. 10219. Mary A. Reed.	H. R. 10852. Sarah Steward.
H. R. 8800. Mary Boyles.	H. R. 9551. Louise Schuckmann.	H. R. 10222. Sarah Howe.	H. R. 10855. Sarah J. Roop.
H. R. 8801. Margaret M. Pinkerton.	H. R. 9555. Harriet Williams.	H. R. 10223. Louisa Burk.	H. R. 10893. Malinda Jack.
H. R. 8815. Anna Chaney.	H. R. 9556. Sarah J. Hyatt.	H. R. 10229. Mary E. Akins.	H. R. 10894. Hattie E. Laraway.
H. R. 8816. Catharine J. Curry.	H. R. 9557. Adelaide Tuthill.	H. R. 10243. Lucetta Sefton.	H. R. 10898. Sarah A. Sitts.
H. R. 8844. Lizzie Alice King.	H. R. 9558. Charlotte W. Stanley.	H. R. 10246. Florence R. Fuller.	H. R. 10902. Isabelle Morris.
H. R. 8856. Sittira Parent.	H. R. 9563. Mary R. Hill.	H. R. 10249. Isabella Sweetser.	H. R. 10903. Mary E. Dunham.
H. R. 8861. Mary E. O'Brien.	H. R. 9601. Elizabeth E. Matthews.	H. R. 10254. Ella M. Harding.	H. R. 10909. Julia A. Gilbert.
H. R. 8862. Mary E. Weston.	H. R. 9602. Christina B. Yaeger.	H. R. 10262. Hester Everard.	H. R. 10911. Paulina B. Cruikshank.
H. R. 8865. Mary Mulverhill.	H. R. 9603. Alice V. Bellney.	H. R. 10264. Caroline Jenkins.	H. R. 10914. Elizabeth Brinkley.
H. R. 8866. Rose Rockenstyre.	H. R. 9608. Elizabeth B. Holmes.	H. R. 10266. Eliza A. Shaffer.	H. R. 10917. Caroline Bean.
H. R. 8867. Maria Lashway.	H. R. 9616. Margaret Ovenburg.	H. R. 10267. Anna French.	H. R. 10918. Mary E. Best.
H. R. 8870. Elizabeth L. Millican.	H. R. 9617. Lucy M. Couse.	H. R. 10268. Susannah E. Young.	H. R. 10919. Maria C. Van Horn.
H. R. 8871. Clarinda Shields.	H. R. 9624. Bell Norris.	H. R. 10272. Hannah J. Porter.	H. R. 10927. Mary L. Huron.
H. R. 8874. Sarah J. Boyd.	H. R. 9631. Hannah Cornelius.	H. R. 10273. Anna M. E. Moser.	H. R. 10931. Sarah E. Hartley.
H. R. 8879. Maggie L. Brown.	H. R. 9636. Susie Bullock.	H. R. 10277. Rebecca Copher.	H. R. 10933. Lucy Wilkes.
H. R. 8880. Catherine Shaffer.	H. R. 9643. Eliza Houchell.	H. R. 10312. Mary A. Longenhagen.	H. R. 10934. Pheba A. Snyder.
H. R. 8881. Elizabeth J. McCreary.	H. R. 9645. Rachael Gambin.	H. R. 10313. Kate Hardenstin.	H. R. 10936. Isabella Peters.
H. R. 8882. Susie Burtner.	H. R. 9652. Emma C. Cotton.	H. R. 10315. Clara O. Horning.	H. R. 10939. Annie M. Munson.
H. R. 8883. Mary E. Critchlow.	H. R. 9653. Mary E. Miller.	H. R. 10322. Laura Barnes.	H. R. 10941. Isabel Reid.
H. R. 8884. Mary Levenia Chambers.	H. R. 9655. Sarah E. Browning.	H. R. 10326. Susan O'Conner.	H. R. 10948. Carrie Watson.
H. R. 8885. Margaret Usseltton.	H. R. 9694. Rosa Vinton.	H. R. 10328. Etta A. Burke.	H. R. 10950. Rebecca A. McCauley.
H. R. 8893. Mary J. Cassidy.	H. R. 9696. Lily Moser.	H. R. 10332. Anna T. Shaw.	H. R. 10971. Caroline Stahl.
H. R. 8929. Sarah J. Shepard.	H. R. 9697. Julia A. Kresge.	H. R. 10333. Lucy Embler.	H. R. 10983. Laura Heaton.
H. R. 8944. Amanda Shannon.	H. R. 9704. Clara McCarty.	H. R. 10342. Joanna Gooch.	H. R. 10988. Jane Davis.
H. R. 8952. Dora P. Miller.	H. R. 9706. Mary C. Adams.	H. R. 10343. Mary E. Moore.	H. R. 10989. Mary A. Savidge.
H. R. 8954. Ellen T. Croshier.		H. R. 10346. Nancy M. Bailey.	

H. R. 11004. Manda Harris.	H. R. 11657. Mary Britton.	H. R. 12340. Letitia Rutter.	H. R. 13122. Jane Kinsey.
H. R. 11005. Amanda Gilbert.	H. R. 11660. Ella F. Paige.	H. R. 12363. Sarah L. Gaskill.	H. R. 13131. Aldyth L. Barnes.
H. R. 11006. Mary L. Dunham.	H. R. 11668. Nannie E. Dunham.	H. R. 12366. Margaret A. Hamblett.	H. R. 13133. Elizabeth Jones.
H. R. 11008. Nancy J. Wilson.	H. R. 11677. Elizabeth Martin.	H. R. 12371. Ella Myres.	H. R. 13134. Elizabeth Ann Simpson.
H. R. 11031. Ellen H. Dilley.	H. R. 11678. Lucinda B. Mitchell.	H. R. 12374. Catharine Sage.	H. R. 13136. Frances A. Blount.
H. R. 11034. Sarah M. Thompson.	H. R. 11680. Catherine A. Miller.	H. R. 12378. Julia A. Johnson.	H. R. 13139. Alice Allen.
H. R. 11037. Lydia A. Crosby.	H. R. 11695. Amelia O'Donnell.	H. R. 12388. Clara Dillon.	H. R. 13162. Almeda L. McClosky.
H. R. 11057. Rosa E. Gordon.	H. R. 11696. Abby J. Scott.	H. R. 12402. Ella Andrews.	H. R. 13166. Clara Henderson.
H. R. 11059. Alice Sweeney.	H. R. 11700. Rebecca E. Hefright.	H. R. 12403. Philancy J. Kirkendall.	H. R. 13167. Ellen M. Terry.
H. R. 11063. Norah Sloan.	H. R. 11705. Matilda Towers.	H. R. 12417. Clara L. Dawson.	H. R. 13170. M. Louise Holaday.
H. R. 11082. Maria Burley.	H. R. 11709. Marie Emelle Allen.	H. R. 12420. Rhoda Sprinkle.	H. R. 13187. Mary B. Mappin.
H. R. 11083. Lorena M. Hickman.	H. R. 11712. Elzora Barnes.	H. R. 12422. Cornelia Ann Bailey.	H. R. 13188. Ellen Nance.
H. R. 11101. Sophia J. Lenix, known as Sophia J. Hyler.	H. R. 11713. Helen S. Cates.	H. R. 12430. Elizabeth I. Exceen.	H. R. 13197. Mary E. Bond.
H. R. 11111. Martha J. Halre.	H. R. 11717. William H. Gray.	H. R. 12455. Josephine E. Gorham.	H. R. 13222. Alice L. Anderson.
H. R. 11112. Mary F. Johnston.	H. R. 11745. Jennie Brothers.	H. R. 12462. Mary E. Stevens.	H. R. 13223. Lucretia E. Bagby.
H. R. 11121. Polly Crum.	H. R. 11748. Caroline Kincade.	H. R. 12466. Harriet A. Owings.	H. R. 13224. Clarinda Demaris.
H. R. 11122. Charlotte A. Smith.	H. R. 11780. Martilla Murrell.	H. R. 12468. Louisa Shaffer.	H. R. 13225. Rosannah Lanham.
H. R. 11126. Kate A. Mann.	H. R. 11781. Mariett McMillan.	H. R. 12471. Roberta Salter.	H. R. 13227. Harriet Partridge.
H. R. 11144. Mary M. Campbell.	H. R. 11782. Mary J. Orr.	H. R. 12474. Lora L. Davis.	H. R. 13231. Susan McGuire.
H. R. 11145. Matilda E. Rider.	H. R. 11789. Mary Beeler.	H. R. 12478. Mary Brady.	H. R. 13232. Ella Oliver.
H. R. 11149. Augusta Hoecker.	H. R. 11790. Mary J. Conkle.	H. R. 12493. Frances Getchell.	H. R. 13236. Jennie W. Ivins.
H. R. 11164. Emma L. Nagle.	H. R. 11791. Mary A. J. Lawhead.	H. R. 12507. Addie Buss.	H. R. 13237. Anna M. Simmons.
H. R. 11165. Mary J. Morrison.	H. R. 11792. Elizabeth Kirker.	H. R. 12508. Mary Jane Bullock.	H. R. 13238. Elizabeth Porch.
H. R. 11170. Sarah C. Lutgen.	H. R. 11794. Emma Cortright.	H. R. 12509. Charlotte Petty.	H. R. 13239. Kate Neville.
H. R. 11171. Sarah J. Penn.	H. R. 11812. Eliza J. Johnson.	H. R. 12510. Emeline Nichols.	H. R. 13253. Mary I. Harwig.
H. R. 11173. Jennie H. Burford.	H. R. 11820. Mary A. Forbes.	H. R. 12512. Margaret Cull.	H. R. 13261. Jennie Messer.
H. R. 11174. Ann Oldfield.	H. R. 11821. Isabell Ilgenfritz.	H. R. 12513. Alice A. Harris.	H. R. 13262. Alice R. Young.
H. R. 11178. Mary Keeler.	H. R. 11825. Sarepta J. Edwards.	H. R. 12516. Ella E. Deering.	H. R. 13280. Dulcena Jones.
H. R. 11179. Ellen A. Seales.	H. R. 11836. Jane Carpenter.	H. R. 12536. Anna B. Ferris.	H. R. 13283. Mary E. Hazzard.
H. R. 11180. Emma L. Perry.	H. R. 11837. Belle Goddard.	H. R. 12539. Mary C. Reed.	H. R. 13284. Martha Huff.
H. R. 11183. Katherine Tipple.	H. R. 11839. Bertha Edmonds.	H. R. 12546. Martha Jane Kendrick.	H. R. 13286. Margaret Mancoer.
H. R. 11184. Adelaide W. Pumphely.	H. R. 11841. Mary Brown.	H. R. 12550. Clarissa Bailey.	H. R. 13287. Catherine Hays.
H. R. 11222. Emma Schmolsmire.	H. R. 11860. Joanna Burnett.	H. R. 12551. Nettie A. Reed.	H. R. 13289. Emily E. Morley.
H. R. 11223. Eliza F. Dixon.	H. R. 11864. Lucinda Jarboe.	H. R. 12553. Susie N. Bell.	H. R. 13290. Delilah D. Kirkpatrick.
H. R. 11235. Catharine A. Smith.	H. R. 11877. Mary Hansmeier.	H. R. 12554. Mary J. Knoderer.	H. R. 13304. Belle F. Shideler.
H. R. 11241. Frances M. Russel.	H. R. 11891. Carrie A. Speck.	H. R. 12555. Nancy J. Milliken.	H. R. 13308. Rachel McKloney.
H. R. 11243. Mary Leffer.	H. R. 11899. Letha Dickens.	H. R. 12556. Annis B. Payne.	H. R. 13324. Anna A. Curley.
H. R. 11249. Julia H. Van Buren.	H. R. 11910. Frany Rice.	H. R. 12557. Mina B. F. Davis.	H. R. 13325. Caroline A. Dubell.
H. R. 11252. Mary S. Roberts.	H. R. 11913. Savilla Kelchner.	H. R. 12581. Rebecca S. Bloom.	H. R. 13329. Fannie M. Fisher.
H. R. 11255. Margaret J. Bruner.	H. R. 11930. Mary E. Hicks.	H. R. 12582. Jennie C. Bennett.	H. R. 13332. Sarah A. Babb.
H. R. 11256. Dorothy J. Edgar.	H. R. 11931. J. Florence Bowers.	H. R. 12585. Christine Abeling.	H. R. 13335. Sarah A. McFarland.
H. R. 11294. Mary A. Schell.	H. R. 11932. Kate C. Closson.	H. R. 12589. Frances M. Moon.	H. R. 13347. Edna L. Saxton.
H. R. 11296. Mary A. Strawn.	H. R. 11941. Caroline Allen.	H. R. 12595. Anna B. Ellis.	H. R. 13350. Thomas A. Snyder.
H. R. 11302. Elvira M. Barnefield.	H. R. 11942. Mary Henderlick.	H. R. 12598. Louisa C. Aggers.	H. R. 13352. Ann G. Bicknell.
H. R. 11316. Evaline Jenkins.	H. R. 11943. Sarah Butterfield.	H. R. 12611. Mary Munsell.	H. R. 13354. Joanna D. Patrick.
H. R. 11317. Lizzie S. Williams.	H. R. 11946. Sarah M. Law.	H. R. 12633. Mary E. Conley.	H. R. 13360. Mary V. Thompson.
H. R. 11318. Eliza H. Raitt.	H. R. 11958. Arrena Rairdon.	H. R. 12634. Mary E. Booker.	H. R. 13363. Susan E. Wilson.
H. R. 11319. Maria C. Frazier.	H. R. 11966. Rebecca P. Clark.	H. R. 12643. Addie A. Turner.	H. R. 13369. Kate Fleming.
H. R. 11320. Virginia G. Black.	H. R. 11967. Nancy G. Yancy.	H. R. 12646. Jennie M. Jones.	H. R. 13386. Hannah Connery.
H. R. 11324. Rebecca Lindsay.	H. R. 11970. Jennett McWade.	H. R. 12654. Mary Wallace.	H. R. 13387. Della Langdon.
H. R. 11326. Ida Custis.	H. R. 11971. Mary L. Miller.	H. R. 12655. Annie M. Hollis.	H. R. 13390. Martha A. Harper.
H. R. 11327. Mary A. Evans.	H. R. 12004. Josephine Chacey.	H. R. 12665. Simon E. Riggleman.	H. R. 13393. Louella Simpson.
H. R. 11328. Emma L. Myers.	H. R. 12005. Rhoda J. Jenkins.	H. R. 12699. Fannie Stevens.	H. R. 13395. Mary Hughes.
H. R. 11329. Mary E. Hurley.	H. R. 12023. Louisa B. Smith.	H. R. 12700. Mary A. Booth.	H. R. 13398. Emma E. Sinnisen.
H. R. 11330. Mary Boylen.	H. R. 12024. Maria C. Garland.	H. R. 12703. Isabella Reedy.	H. R. 13423. Ellen Poyner.
H. R. 11345. Belle Garrett.	H. R. 12027. Mary E. Elliott.	H. R. 12716. Rebecca M. Spires.	H. R. 13424. Annie Hanford.
H. R. 11347. Julia M. Ford.	H. R. 12045. Emmaline Reed.	H. R. 12719. Louis Annamiller.	H. R. 13426. Emma E. Price.
H. R. 11348. Esther C. Sawyer.	H. R. 12046. Hannah Lichtstein.	H. R. 12721. Susan J. Kessinger.	H. R. 13427. Johanna Meyer.
H. R. 11376. Carrie T. C. Brown.	H. R. 12055. Delphine Darling.	H. R. 12726. Mary J. Jenness.	H. R. 13433. Clara A. Estry.
H. R. 11379. Alice A. Jackman.	H. R. 12056. Lavonia F. Richey.	H. R. 12741. Emma Brown.	H. R. 13436. Mary J. Parker.
H. R. 11382. Mary Fallon.	H. R. 12075. Mary J. Brown.	H. R. 12750. Jane Elizabeth Carr.	H. R. 13437. Caroline R. Raynor.
H. R. 11386. Sarah J. Adams.	H. R. 12077. Matilda A. Millard.	H. R. 12753. Anna Huls.	H. R. 13466. Susan J. Boston.
H. R. 11387. Hannah E. Odell.	H. R. 12080. Lizzie M. Bowersox.	H. R. 12761. Ida L. Moore.	H. R. 13467. Blanche Holston.
H. R. 11390. Amelia Drake.	H. R. 12088. Adeline C. Keenan.	H. R. 12762. Rosamond T. Will.	H. R. 13468. Margaret Hayes.
H. R. 11392. Matilda L. Hardman.	H. R. 12090. Rebecca A. Brown.	H. R. 12787. Harry Bixler, known as Harry Bicksler.	H. R. 13470. Elizabeth K. Kershaw.
H. R. 11393. Mary P. Crawford.	H. R. 12092. Callie Jones.	H. R. 12788. Mary Ryder.	H. R. 13471. Fannie F. Marts.
H. R. 11395. Georgia G. Biggs.	H. R. 12094. Harriet A. Wiles.	H. R. 12792. Hellen A. Sleigh.	H. R. 13472. Jennie N. Milliken.
H. R. 11419. Sarah E. Ward Gold- smith.	H. R. 12097. Catherine Knoeb.	H. R. 12800. Jennie M. Otto.	H. R. 13485. Lizaetta Stuckey.
H. R. 11430. Sallie J. Courter.	H. R. 12114. Martha J. Burchfield.	H. R. 12824. Fannie S. McMullin.	H. R. 13487. Elizabeth Ginn.
H. R. 11437. Alice A. Kirkham.	H. R. 12119. Martha Ann Campbell.	H. R. 12831. Jennie H. Owen.	H. R. 13488. Bliss Evans Paul.
H. R. 11445. Jennie S. Graham.	H. R. 12120. Mary M. Headley.	H. R. 12836. Eunice J. Brooks.	H. R. 13494. Ellen O'Neill.
H. R. 11446. Mary Delige.	H. R. 12124. Martha Grubb.	H. R. 12839. Beckie E. Hyman.	H. R. 13497. Elizabeth Miller.
H. R. 11457. Florence Campbell.	H. R. 12132. Cellinda E. Fox.	H. R. 12861. Nancy Napier.	H. R. 13517. Edna Olney Chrisman.
H. R. 11486. Mary E. Halter.	H. R. 12143. Cella A. Hackett.	H. R. 12862. Nancy B. Stockton.	H. R. 13520. Catharine Knudson.
H. R. 11490. Susan A. Hawk.	H. R. 12148. Cornelia C. Hammond.	H. R. 12865. Nellie L. Cluff.	H. R. 13523. Maranda F. Seals.
H. R. 11498. Mary E. Burtner.	H. R. 12156. Margaret N. Gordon.	H. R. 12870. Catharine Browning.	H. R. 13526. Rosa Meyer.
H. R. 11504. Ella M. O'Bryan.	H. R. 12159. Frances E. Covell.	H. R. 12874. Gertrude Schoeninger.	H. R. 13527. Sarah A. Fulkerson.
H. R. 11513. Sarah E. Thrasher.	H. R. 12162. Martha A. Richey.	H. R. 12881. Mary McCoy.	H. R. 13534. Elizabeth McLeister.
H. R. 11514. Elvira Clotfelter.	H. R. 12163. Jane Snyder.	H. R. 12887. Catharine E. Whyde.	H. R. 13536. Arminna P. Rice.
H. R. 11540. Elizabeth S. Keim.	H. R. 12164. Elizabeth B. Garvin.	H. R. 12888. Adelia M. P. Jackson.	H. R. 13543. Emily C. Mather.
H. R. 11541. Catherine Rider.	H. R. 12165. Catherine J. Jones.	H. R. 12889. Mary A. Crabb.	H. R. 13545. Helen R. Godsoe.
H. R. 11552. Martha A. Budd.	H. R. 12167. Sarah Smith.	H. R. 12921. Rhoda E. Sperry.	H. R. 13551. Myzella Rowe.
H. R. 11553. Blenda C. Moore.	H. R. 12181. Mary A. Wilson.	H. R. 12927. Joanna J. Reid.	H. R. 13558. Mary W. Ryan.
H. R. 11554. Rocella Dennis.	H. R. 12182. Phoebe J. Massey.	H. R. 12936. Eliza Jane Brill.	H. R. 13559. Rachel Goble.
H. R. 11555. Virginia A. Harris.	H. R. 12196. Nancy A. Bell.	H. R. 12939. Isabella Jones.	H. R. 13561. Annie E. Toomey.
H. R. 11557. Nora B. Biesecker.	H. R. 12209. Newton Loyd.	H. R. 12941. Martha E. Moffatt.	H. R. 13569. Martha Lamb.
H. R. 11567. Alvira Byrum.	H. R. 12210. Lillie M. Wooster.	H. R. 12957. Minnie L. Sanders.	H. R. 13570. Frances M. Lynch.
H. R. 11570. Mary E. Logel.	H. R. 12212. Mary L. Merchant.	H. R. 12958. Rachel Croston.	H. R. 13572. Martha E. Read.
H. R. 11571. Fannie F. Wilson.	H. R. 12214. Martha Studdard.	H. R. 12959. Mary J. Hovey.	H. R. 13574. Sarah A. Stephens.
H. R. 11572. Sarah J. Edmonds.	H. R. 12217. Amanda Koon.	H. R. 12967. Christiana Taylor.	H. R. 13575. Laura A. Eldred.
H. R. 11576. Mary E. Boyd.	H. R. 12221. Dorothy H. Grover.	H. R. 12971. Carrie E. Klepper.	H. R. 13577. Katie M. Vandyke.
H. R. 11600. Sarah A. Nugent.	H. R. 12222. Sarah J. Claypool.	H. R. 12979. Sallie J. Mast.	H. R. 13579. Jane Fortney.
H. R. 11611. Margaret Steadman.	H. R. 12223. Addie R. Bostick.	H. R. 12982. Alice Keck.	H. R. 13581. Emma L. Bruce.
H. R. 11613. Mollie Tarvin.	H. R. 12224. Jennie Nash.	H. R. 12997. Sarah E. Parrish.	H. R. 13583. Isabel Simpson.
H. R. 11615. Sarah E. Davis.	H. R. 12226. Meltha M. Coss.	H. R. 12999. Anna E. Walters.	H. R. 13585. Dolly Matoxen.
H. R. 11632. Katie Mulford.	H. R. 12227. Eliza Wilson.	H. R. 13003. Sarah E. Peabody.	H. R. 13588. Jessie L. Clark.
H. R. 11636. Margaret A. Monahan.	H. R. 12231. Lugenia Marquis.	H. R. 13004. Kate Krisher.	H. R. 13604. Emily C. Colvin.
H. R. 11638. Mary E. Hyatt.	H. R. 12263. Mary A. Millican.	H. R. 13017. Sarah J. Scott.	H. R. 13605. Cora Nevil.
H. R. 11640. Lydia M. Robinson.	H. R. 12266. Karline Knudson.	H. R. 13020. Annie L. Lacey.	H. R. 13610. John T. Truax.
H. R. 11644. Lizzie J. Grosvenor.	H. R. 12272. Elizabeth Flickinger.	H. R. 13021. Martha J. Bennett.	H. R. 13613. Phebie Hamilton.
H. R. 11645. Harriet E. Ashbey.	H. R. 12273. Charity Dewey.	H. R. 13028. Olive H. McMillan.	H. R. 13628. Daniel B. Fitzpatrick.
H. R. 11646. Carrie Latham.	H. R. 12277. Lillie Beitter.	H. R. 13040. Lucy V. Buckingham.	H. R. 13629. Catherine D. Hyland.
H. R. 11647. Elizabeth H. Shelley.	H. R. 12279. Grace E. Todd.	H. R. 13045. Sarah J. Knight.	H. R. 13631. Gertrude Williams.
H. R. 11648. Helen M. Steward.	H. R. 12283. Centrilla L. Bailey.	H. R. 13047. Anna J. Rourke.	H. R. 13634. Sylvia Bryan.
H. R. 11649. Anne E. Phillips.	H. R. 12285. Hattie Loring.	H. R. 13059. Cordelia Childers.	H. R. 13641. Helen E. McCartney.
H. R. 11650. Margaret W. Lathrop.	H. R. 12296. Mary Ellen Nelson.	H. R. 13075. Sarah E. Biggs.	H. R. 13642. Sarah A. Cole.
H. R. 11651. Martha J. Caryl.	H. R. 12298. Elizabeth E. Deputy.	H. R. 13081. Sarah F. Tighe.	H. R. 13657. Elizabeth C. Van Al- stine.
H. R. 11652. Adelaide P. Sawyer.	H. R. 12300. Emma Gibbens.	H. R. 13090. Clara A. Thompson.	H. R. 13661. Adeline Pitzer.
H. R. 11653. Emma T. Barnes.	H. R. 12301. Elizabeth M. Thomas.	H. R. 13093. Norah M. Oberlender.	H. R. 13663. Kate Pomeroy.
H. R. 11654. Sarah J. Green.	H. R. 12302. Julia A. Fritz.	H. R. 13102. Thelda Hightower.	H. R. 13670. Violet A. Williams.
H. R. 11655. Mary J. Hayes.	H. R. 12310. Nancy L. Many.	H. R. 13103. Nellie Barrows.	H. R. 13675. Mary L. Emrie.
	H. R. 12331. Evaline Zelph.	H. R. 13104. Countess B. Duffin.	H. R. 13676. Martha M. Turner.
	H. R. 12332. Mary E. Jones.	H. R. 13118. Maria F. Shuman.	H. R. 13679. Mary A. McMican.

H. R. 13680. Eliza Goodell.
 H. R. 13700. Elvira J. Ellison.
 H. R. 13720. Annie M. Lovell.
 H. R. 13726. Elizabeth A. Taylor.
 H. R. 13735. Kishah J. Huneft.
 H. R. 13740. Anna L. Depp.
 H. R. 13758. Mary Alderice.
 H. R. 13759. Ada E. Pattin.
 H. R. 13760. Hannah Sayles.
 H. R. 13761. Anne Corte.
 H. R. 13762. Mary Ann Meeker.
 H. R. 13765. Ambrose R. Cyrus, alias A. C. Cyrus.
 H. R. 13774. Ellen J. Bergen.
 H. R. 13775. Laura A. Nason.
 H. R. 13791. Agnes W. Case.
 H. R. 13804. Adella Chilson.
 H. R. 13805. Sarah Shoemaker.
 H. R. 13806. Mary E. H. Smith.
 H. R. 13807. Mary A. Blakey.
 H. R. 13818. Jemima Robinson.
 H. R. 13835. John Fitzwater.
 H. R. 13836. Elizabeth Roberts.
 H. R. 13839. A. Clark Rader, alias Clark Rader.
 H. R. 13842. Annie Brooks.
 H. R. 13844. Mary M. Miller.
 H. R. 13859. Charlotte K. Vought.
 H. R. 13860. Katherine Z. Bates.
 H. R. 13863. Jennie L. Dockum.
 H. R. 13864. Charles M. Barnes.
 H. R. 13865. Bridget Deady.
 H. R. 13891. Harriet J. Young.
 H. R. 13892. Anna M. Shank.
 H. R. 13894. Josephine M. Alexander.
 H. R. 13896. Elizabeth J. Varner.
 H. R. 13898. Minnie M. Smith.
 H. R. 13903. Orpha A. Kilgore.
 H. R. 13904. Talitha J. Toddhunter.
 H. R. 13906. Lydia D. Porter.
 H. R. 13907. Nettie Bay.
 H. R. 13910. Leona Healy.
 H. R. 13911. Alwilda Vinard.
 H. R. 13915. Annie C. Rand.
 H. R. 13916. Emily J. Williams.
 H. R. 13920. Sarah B. Woodruff.
 H. R. 13924. Sarah O. Acheson.
 H. R. 13925. Rhoda Dixon.
 H. R. 13926. Celestia A. Finks.
 H. R. 13938. Kizziah S. Casey.
 H. R. 13940. Hattie E. Lewis.
 H. R. 13942. Leila Newell Smith.
 H. R. 13943. Lydia A. P. Conover.
 H. R. 13944. Hannah F. Dunn.
 H. R. 13945. Matilda A. Storms.
 H. R. 13946. Mary Livingston.
 H. R. 13951. Ida Vancil.
 H. R. 13952. M. Elizabeth (Isibell) Clevenger.
 H. R. 13958. Uttie N. Grooms.
 H. R. 13963. Sarah E. McHolland.
 H. R. 13964. Nancy Elizabeth Armstrong.
 H. R. 13969. Phila Cross.
 H. R. 13970. Olive A. Baker.
 H. R. 14008. Rebecca Parris.
 H. R. 14018. Margaret A. Rockwell.
 H. R. 14020. Naomi E. Glover.
 H. R. 14024. Elizabeth Jarvis.
 H. R. 14025. Lizzie Simpson.
 H. R. 14026. Frank Simpson.
 H. R. 14027. Pamela Chaney.
 H. R. 14029. Olive Kimmel.
 H. R. 14041. Nancy G. Lemley.
 H. R. 14042. Catharine Hoyt.
 H. R. 14059. Dianna Wright.
 H. R. 14060. Matilda D. Mason.
 H. R. 14064. Elizabeth Gibson.
 H. R. 14081. Sarah A. Williams.
 H. R. 14086. Mary Parker.
 H. R. 14094. Eliza D. Hughes.
 H. R. 14098. Harriet J. Bishop.
 H. R. 14099. Katie Randall.
 H. R. 14100. William W. Cooper.
 H. R. 14102. Rebecca A. Jordan.
 H. R. 14105. Aria A. Underwood.
 H. R. 14106. Lovisa Pierce.
 H. R. 14108. Sarah Hall.
 H. R. 14109. Sarah A. Kennedy.
 H. R. 14138. Jane Hooker.
 H. R. 14140. Alice Wilson.
 H. R. 14198. Caroline Cless.
 H. R. 14202. Lavina E. Moore.
 H. R. 14203. Sarah Ann Moore.
 H. R. 14204. Maggie Conley.
 H. R. 14227. Martha B. Hood.
 H. R. 14228. Medora L. Naramore.
 H. R. 14233. Nettie A. Jackson.
 H. R. 14238. Hulda Thompson Garner.
 H. R. 14239. Sarah Scivally.
 H. R. 14240. Eliza A. Brewer.
 H. R. 14252. Minerva Guy.
 H. R. 14253. Annie E. Whip.
 H. R. 14254. Virginia C. Burns.
 H. R. 14256. Nancy C. Lecklider.
 H. R. 14287. Catherine E. Russell.
 H. R. 14345. Nancy Ann Wright.
 H. R. 14509. Elizabeth Junken.
 H. R. 14517. Martha Willoughby.
 H. R. 14522. Nancy J. Armstrong.
 H. R. 14525. Sarrab E. McHobson.
 H. R. 14646. Mary E. Savage.
 H. R. 14648. Mary D. Heistand.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.
 The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: Page 59, strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Carrie S. Richey, having died.

Page 88, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Nancy E. Mount, having died.

Page 106, strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 107, strike out lines 1 and 2, the proposed beneficiary, Sarah E. Wirick, having died.

Page 128, strike out lines 8 to 12, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Lucy A. Johnson, having died.

Page 148, strike out lines 14 to 17, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Frances E. Bolan, having died.

Page 148, strike out lines 22, 23, and 24, and on page 149, strike out lines 1 and 2, the proposed beneficiary, Nellie L. Burns, having died.

Page 207, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Olive H. Woods, having died.

Page 207, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Mary M. Tappana, having died.

Page 211, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Mary E. Robinson, having died.

Page 218, strike out lines 16 to 21, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Mary J. Anderson, having died.

Page 234, strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Janie R. Stewart, having died.

Page 267, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Julia Cramer, having died.

Page 286, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Helena Hasenstab, having died.

Page 286, strike out lines 23 and 24, and page 287, strike out lines 1 and 2, the proposed beneficiary, Prissilla Storms, having died.

Page 301, strike out lines 14 to 17, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Lucy A. Blakeley, having died.

Page 302, strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Ella Moore, having died.

Page 351, strike out lines 21 to 24, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Elizabeth Duxtater, having died.

Page 454, strike out lines 24 and 25, and page 455, strike out lines 1 and 2, the proposed beneficiary, Meltha M. Coss, having died.

Page 483, strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Dulcena Jones, having died.

Page 489, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Elizabeth K. Kershaw, having died.

Page 497, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Sylvia Bryan, having died.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, these amendments reduce the estimated cost of the bill \$2,640 per annum; the estimated annual cost of the bill as now reported is \$415,524.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1930

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, disagree to all the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked for.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14801) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state to the House whether or not that is agreeable to the member of the Post Office Committee from this side of the House, who is ill?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked for. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. WOOD, Mr. THATCHER, and Mr. BYRNS.

NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

Auf der Heide	Denison	Jeffers	Parker
Beck, Pa.	Dickstein	Jenkins	Peavey
Beck, Wis.	Doutrich	Johnson, Wash.	Peery
Cooper, Ohio	Dowell	Kearns	Porter
Crosser	Doyle	Kelly	Prall
Bell	Evans, Calif.	Kemp	Quayle
Boles	Faust	Kent	Rainey
Bowles	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	King	Ransley
Boylan	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Kunz	Reed, Ark.
Britten	Fletcher	Kvale	Reed, N. Y.
Browne	Foss	Lea, Calif.	Reid, Ill.
Buckbee	Frear	Lindsay	Robison, Ky.
Bushy	Fulbright	Lathicum	Romjue
Bushong	Furlow	Lyon	Sanders, N. Y.
Butler	Gambrill	McClintic	Somers, N. Y.
Carew	Garber	McCormack	Sprout, Kans.
Carley	Garrett, Tenn.	Maas	Strother
Casey	Gibson	Menges	Sullivan
Cole, Md.	Goldner	Montague	Tatgenhorst
Combs	Goldsborough	Mooney	Tillman
Conner	Graham	Moore, Ky.	Underwood
Crowther	Griest	Moore, N. J.	Updike
Cullen	Hammer	Moore, Ohio	Weller
Curry	Hare	Morgan	Welsh, Pa.
Davenport	Hudspeth	Norton, N. J.	White, Kans.
Davey	Hull, William E.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Wolfenden
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver, N. Y.	Wurzbach
	Igoe	Palmer	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-two Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

HON. THEODORE E. BURTON

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our distinguished and revered colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] be allowed to address the House out of order. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is at the same time a most happy occasion for me and a melancholy one. I can not exaggerate my reluctance in leaving this body, and on the kind suggestion of the gentleman from Connecticut I prize most highly the opportunity to address a few words of greeting to my colleagues on this the last day of my service in the House of Representatives.

My membership in this House has lasted for 24 years, in three different periods. It commenced 40 years ago the coming 4th of March. There is no one else in House or Senate whose tenure of office commenced at so early a date except our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER]. As I look over this body I recognize how many were born after I first came to this House, how many of the multitude with whom I have served have come and gone and how many have passed on. My association here has been with Presidents of the United States, with men who have occupied a most notable position not only in the legislative halls of the House and Senate but in the executive departments of the Government. I have been acquainted, with some degree of intimacy, with every President, beginning with Benjamin Harrison.

In this period of 40 years how wonderful are the changes that have occurred in our own country and this great world of ours. I feel sometimes as if I were moving in a different universe from that which existed when I first came to Congress, and I again refer to the many who have passed on with whom I have associated. I can say in the language of the great German poet:

They hear not the following words
The souls that listened to my first.

As one of long experience here I feel it perhaps a duty to offer certain words of advice and injunction to those with whom I have served. I do not wish that there should be forgotten the causes that I have advocated. In most instances the membership of the House has agreed with me; in some they have not, and I have accepted their dissent with the spirit of a genuine sport. I sincerely hope that no measure may be passed increasing the size of this House. [Applause.] When my membership commenced there were 325 only as against 435. On each occasion when there has been an increase it has been the distinct promise of those who favored it that there should be no further addition to the membership when the succeeding censuses were taken, but there was an increase in 1890, 1900, and 1910. I can not too strongly emphasize the disadvantages in the transaction of public business in a large House as compared with a smaller House, and I must again, with some delicacy, refer to the diminished prestige that belongs to the membership with every successive addition.

May I speak rather bluntly, my colleagues? You have served with me, so let me leave this injunction: Be courageous in voting upon all the questions coming before the House. There are some who in forgetfulness neglect to realize how much the average citizen prizes courage. Do not yield to the sudden impulses of an uninformed public opinion. Do not listen to the selfish propaganda of groups and different elements. If I leave the House with one disposition of regret it is that I have seen some Members, perfectly well intentioned and seeking to do their duty, overborne by propaganda in the advocacy of measures here or policies which mature consideration would have taught were not for the best interests of the people and of the whole people. The voice of conservatism is that not always the first but sometimes the second voice of the people is the voice of God, and while I would not advise you to adhere to any hide-bound conservatism, I would ask you to stand by the things which should not be shaken.

I have taken great interest here in our foreign relations, always with this one central idea: America first and patriotism our chiefest duty. [Applause.] But I have sometimes seen a spirit of distrust and unkindness for other members of the great family of nations, which I regret. The world is becoming more and more one great social and economic republic, and to occupy our proper place in the sun we must harmonize with every other people. If we have that commercial supremacy which we desire we must be fair to every other people. If we have that respect which we earnestly wish we must show ourselves deserving of respect by fairness and even by generosity in our dealings with the other countries of the earth. If we assume that leadership which, I think, proudly our own America should assume, we must show that, by our disposition toward other peoples, by a constant spirit of justice, good will, and a desire for cooperation, we are worthy of that leadership.

Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's,
Thy God's and truth's.

It is better to face defeat in an election than it is to swerve one iota from the path of principle and that which commends itself to the conscience of the individual Members.

I am sincerely hoping that in the very near future progress may be made in the cause of international peace. To speak to you freely, one reason why I sought to become a Member of the Senate was because it has so much larger a part in international relations, though we have tried here to do our best in that regard. I trust you may not be misled by the din of armies and by any pride about supremacy on the sea to adopt legislation which shall prevent us from taking that part we should as a peace-loving Nation and as one that deserves the support of other countries in assuming that leadership which we should enjoy. [Applause.]

The year is closing with two directly antagonistic facts in view, one the Briand and Kellogg treaties, which are more than a gesture. They are a declaration by more than 50 nations that war, as an instrument of policy, shall be condemned. I can not believe this declaration to be insincere or without the most salutary results. On the other hand, between two nations of South America there is a very bitter controversy. The whole framework of methods for conciliation and the avoidance of war is at stake in that controversy. Both countries are members of the League of Nations, and it is our earnest hope that the league will vindicate itself as an agency for peace in preventing armed collision between those two countries. Both are parties to treaties that promised, by conciliation, to avoid the outbreak of war. If in spite of these two facts war should break out, the question will be agitated the world over: Are your treaties for commissions of inquiry and are your memberships in the League of Nations any guaranty against nations flying at each other's throats and engaging in war, or is it true in the case of these two countries that they are less advanced in civilization and in the factors which make for world comity and for peace? We ask that question with the utmost deference.

I have sought to maintain here a rational economy. I have opposed extravagant measures. We must, on the other hand, realize that this is a great and expanding country, that the activities of the Federal Government are gaining larger volume year by year, and while public expenditures should be watched with the utmost care, it is only the most sanguine who can expect that their volume will be decreased.

I do not wish to detain you too long. I wish this parting to be without formality. I do not wish that anyone should feel called upon to respond to my remarks. I will only say good bye. I can not say farewell to many lifelong friendships, so large a number of pleasant associations. I shall hope to linger near you in the years of my life that are to follow. I shall make a constant study of your transactions. I hope at times to come in among you and see what you are doing. Health, happiness, prosperity to you all, every one.

I can not omit to state that the good will which has been manifested for me has been irrespective of party, irrespective of locality.

It is a wonderful responsibility you have to America and to the world. May your deliberations be with dignity, with the avoidance of petty squabbles or personal recrimination, with temperance in language used regarding those outside of this body, for these characteristics are worthy of a great body like this.

The future of our country, which we hope will be far better than the past, rests very much in your hands. Face this responsibility, I pray you, with courage, with wisdom, and while I would not decry partisanship, let not bitter partisanship be the motive which actuates any of you. It is with the highest hopes that I utter these words, with the hope that in the future this great House of Representatives may be worthy of its traditions in the past, that as I think of those who have gone before I am not like one speaking to a banquet hall deserted, but worthy successors are coming with each successive election, that those upon whose brow rests the dew of youth will gather with those of maturer age in the making of this House what it should be, a great factor for human betterment, for human progress, for equality of opportunity, for constant addition to the advancement and the glory of our own United States, which we have promised to serve. [Prolonged applause, all Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] for 30 minutes.

BOULDER DAM GIVEN FAVORABLE REPORT BY SIBERT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, opponents of the Boulder Dam project in this body, and in another body, profess great satisfaction with the recent report of

the board of engineers appointed under an act of Congress to investigate and report on this project. The contention of these people seems to be that the report of this board substantiates in every particular the contentions made against this project, and necessitates a scrapping of the pending legislation authorizing the project. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The report of the board resolves all major engineering disputes in favor of the Boulder Dam project. Practically every one of the controverted issues which were raised last session have been answered in favor of the proponents. I agree with the editorial comment of the Engineering News-Record of December 13, 1928, in which they say:

Public service of unusually high type is reflected in the report of the engineering board of review on the Boulder Dam project. Responding fully, sanely, and unequivocally to the queries placed before it, the report answers the major doubts with which Congress and the general citizen were disturbed last spring in the discussion of this contentious issue.

The Engineering News-Record holds, which I think is true, that "the board takes an extreme attitude of conservatism," although "this," it says, "can not reasonably be criticized, in a work of such character and magnitude."

The editorial then proceeds to list the answers which the report gives to the "major doubts" raised in the last session of Congress, as follows:

First. It declares that the proposed 550-foot dam is feasible, is capable of being safely and readily built.

Second. It finds that the project will be effective to carry out the specific combination of purposes for which it was devised—namely, flood control, silt removal, flow equalization for most efficient water supply, and power generation.

Third. It concludes that the canal into Imperial Valley can be built and maintained successfully, contrary to what has been claimed by many critics.

Fourth. It holds that the power by-product of the dam is needed and is valuable, and the project will pay, after due deduction (which, as we understand the last proceedings, has previously been contemplated) of flood-protection charges and the cost of the Imperial Valley canal.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. Let me first finish my statement, and then if I have any time I will be pleased to yield.

ENGINEERING BOARD APPROVES BLACK CANYON SITE IN EVERY PARTICULAR

Many people assumed that because the engineering board recommended the Black Canyon site that this was something new and different from what had heretofore been advocated as the Boulder Dam project. Such is not the case. Boulder and Black Canyon sites are only about 20 miles apart, and a dam in either place, of the same height, will accomplish practically the same results and will store the same amount of water in the identical reservoir basin. Both sites were thoroughly investigated by the Reclamation Service, but Black Canyon was considered the better site by them. The Swing-Johnson bill authorizes the construction of the dam at either of the two sites.

The Sibert Board recommends the Black Canyon site. This site is named in the Swing-Johnson bill, and is the one that was recommended in the Weymouth report for the reason that a dam can be built at that site at a lower cost than at Boulder Canyon, because—

- (a) The canyon is narrower.
- (b) The rock in the foundations and abutments is better suited for a high dam.
- (c) More storage will be created for a dam of the same height.
- (d) It is nearer the railroad.
- (e) There is a better location for the construction plant, and so forth.

In approving the site the board made the following very favorable findings:

- (a) The site is about 40 miles from Las Vegas, Nev., and the Union Pacific Railroad.
- (b) The approach is comparatively easy to the vicinity and not particularly difficult to the site itself.
- (c) A construction railroad from Las Vegas would pass near available gravel deposits and the best quarry sites lie immediately adjacent to the dam site on the line of approach.
- (d) The terrain where the quarries, railway shops, and camps would be located is open, and its development into such use at reasonable cost is entirely practicable.
- 1. The rock gorge at this location is 110 to 127 feet below low water. The gorge at the dam site is 350 feet wide at the low-water line and 880 feet wide at the crest of the dam.
- 2. The foundation is a * * * tough, durable mass of rock standing with remarkably steep walls * * *. The whole rock mass is essentially impervious.

3. It is an almost ideal rock for tunneling, is satisfactory in every essential, and is suitable for use in construction.

4. The associated rock formations at higher levels, more advantageously situated for development for construction uses * * * are of excellent quality for that purpose. Near by there are deposits of angular gravels that have been proven by test to be suitable for use in construction.

5. There is no doubt whatever but that the rock formations of this site are competent to carry safely the heavy load and abutment thrusts contemplated. It is well adapted to making a tight seal and for opposing water seepage and circulation under and around the ends of the dam. It insures successful tunneling and, so far as the rock is concerned, the general safety and permanence of the proposed structures.

6. The board is of the opinion that the Black Canyon site is suitable for the proposed dam.

ENGINEERING BOARD NEGATIVES EARTHQUAKE DANGER

To many the most alarming and disturbing assertion made by our opponents the last session was that the proposed site was located in an earthquake area and that the dam might in this way be destroyed. This argument was urged following the failure of the St. Francis Dam, with the resultant disaster, although the St. Francis failed solely because of foundation weaknesses and not because of earthquakes.

The gentleman from Arizona in his address to the House last session said:

It has been stated by reputable engineers that Boulder Canyon is in an earthquake area. Two months ago there was an article in the Literary Digest showing the location of seismic disturbances throughout the world, and there was a large black dot over Boulder Canyon. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 23, p. 9860.)

This same gentleman in his minority views went even further in urging this supposed danger. On page 6 of his report he declares:

General Goethals testified that in a mass of masonry as large as the proposed Boulder Dam stresses and strains heretofore unknown would probably develop. Boulder Canyon Dam may fail because of such stresses and strains. The location of the dam site has been said to be in an area in which earth tremors occur. In the southwestern desert I personally have seen cracks in the earth many feet wide, caused by seismic disturbances. Should there during the course of years be such a disturbance in Boulder Canyon the dam will fail.

First, let me point out that my friend from Arizona was in error in his reference to General Goethals's testimony. General Goethals was before the committee in support of the proposal of Mr. W. G. Clark, to build a rock-filled dam 1,155 feet above bedrock at Boulder Canyon. His reference to unknown stresses was in connection with this proposed colossal height of dam and not in connection with the 550-foot dam proposed in my bill. Furthermore, General Goethals distinctly stated that the site was suitable for a masonry or concrete dam of the height proposed by us for Boulder Canyon. His testimony is found at page 747 of the 1924 hearings, as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN. Are you convinced that the danger from earthquakes is so serious that a rigid masonry type of dam should not be adopted at that site?

General GOETHALS. No. As between the masonry dam and the concrete, or the filled dam, going to that height, I would rather put in a rock-filled dam; that is all.

Mr. HAYDEN. And any type of dam if properly constructed would be a safe dam at Boulder Canyon?

General GOETHALS. I think so.

It thus appears that General Goethals did not support the contention of the opponents that the dam might fail because of stresses and strains or that it might be destroyed by earthquakes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I will.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will not the gentleman state to the House that in speaking of earthquakes on the floor of the House I said that the dam could be designed to withstand earthquake shock, but that the dam as designed by the Reclamation Service for a maximum of 40 tons was not safe?

Mr. SWING. Whatever the gentleman says that he said I will agree to.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Does not the gentleman think it should be said that the Sibert Board recommended the dam designed for a maximum stress of 30 tons per square foot?

Mr. SWING. I am talking about earthquakes. The gentleman led the House to believe that there was great danger from earthquake.

Speaking before this House in support of my bill, I asserted there was—

no evidence of earthquakes in the vicinity.

I said:

True, there have been found some old faults in the surface of the earth near Boulder Dam site, but all the evidence, according to Doctor Ransome, "indicate some measure of antiquity." There has not been, he says, any movement along these faults since civilized man inhabited North America.

Now, on this issue raised between my friend from Arizona and myself, what did the Sibert Board find the facts to be? They found that there was no danger whatever from earthquakes. In this they confirmed the positive views of Doctor Ransome contained in the Weymouth report.

The board of engineers reported:

In former geologic times this district was subjected repeatedly to volcanism and deformation. These events must have been accompanied by earthquakes. Such evidence as there is, both to be observed in the field and to be gathered from records, indicates that these geological activities ceased long ago and that the region has been virtually undisturbed for a very long time. The district is recognized as having comparative freedom from present-day earth movements.

The foundation is a volcanic breccia or tuff, originally an accumulation of fragments of many kinds derived from volcanic eruptions and now transformed into a well cemented, tough, durable mass of rock, standing with remarkably steep walls and resisting the attack of weather and erosion exceptionally well. The whole rock mass is essentially impervious.

The rock formation * * * is satisfactory in every essential.

And again:

There is no doubt whatever but that the rock formations of this site are competent to carry safely the heavy load and abutment thrusts contemplated. It is well adapted to making a tight seal and for opposing water seepage and circulation under and around the ends of the dam. It insures * * * so far as the rock is concerned, the general safety and permanence of the proposed structures.

I do not know what more could be said to more fully demolish the arguments of the opponents relative to the unsuitability of the site for a high dam. The board concludes with this final positive and all-embracing declaration:

The board is of the opinion that it is feasible from an engineering standpoint to build a dam across the Colorado River at Black Canyon that will safely impound water to an elevation of 550 feet above low water.

And—

A dam of 550 feet above low water, across the Colorado River at Black Canyon, impounding 26,000,000 acre-feet of water, will be adequate, in the opinion of the board, to so regulate the flow of the lower Colorado as to control ordinary floods, to improve the present navigation possibilities, and to store and deliver the available water for reclamation of public lands and for other beneficial uses within the United States.

ADDITIONAL FAVORABLE FINDING

The Sibert Board has cleared up a number of additional controversial questions which have clouded the main issue. They knocked into a cocked hat the bugabooed argument which has been bandied about for the past eight years about the quantity of salt in the reservoir which it was alleged would destroy the value of the water for irrigation and domestic purposes. The board finds that—

the actual salt content will not be increased to an injurious amount even in the beginning, and that in a comparatively short time * * * the salt content of the river waters will be reduced to about the present amount.

Of course, the present waters are the domestic supply of more than 100,000 people and is the source of the fertility of the Imperial and Yuma Valleys.

The board also settles the controversy that the dam will not desilt the river below it. It was asserted by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS], and by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD], that the reservoir would not desilt, and that that may be forever the water below would be so filled with silt that the benefits we have claimed for it, to wit, the removing of silt as a flood menace, because the silt now builds up the lower bed of the river and tends to make overflow possible, and if any quantity of silt is in the water it will make it bad for domestic uses.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will not the gentleman in fairness eliminate the word "forever" and say for a period of years?

Mr. SWING. The gentleman from Utah made the statement in his report—

the silt problem would not be solved for a period of many years, probably from 20 to 100, if indeed it is ever solved by this dam.

The silt problem is important, because, first, silt builds up the bed of the river in the lower basin and thereby adds directly to the flood menace. Silt also chokes up the channels, ditches, and laterals in all of the irrigation systems and makes the agricultural industry that much more difficult. Also any considerable quantity of silt in the water would of course depreciate its value for domestic uses.

However, the board makes a definite favorable finding upon this controversy. They say:

When the dam is built and clear water issues from the reservoir a new load of silt will be picked up along its course through these deposits. In the beginning this load is certain to be about as heavy as it is normally present. But, * * * a tendency of silt stabilization will follow as the river becomes very deeply entrenched and develops a paved bed. As soon as this stage is reached * * * silt conditions will have improved. This improvement is certain to continue with time * * * we believe that marked improvement will be shown within the first 10 years.

With reference to the amount of silt that will flow into the reservoir the board again took an "ultraconservative" position. They assumed the maximum quantity of silt that has ever been estimated for that point on the river, to wit, 137,000 acre-feet per year. The Reclamation Service has estimated the silt content of the river for a great many years. The Imperial Irrigation Service also has carried on studies of the same subject for over 10 years. The estimates of the Reclamation Service and the Imperial Irrigation Service are that the silt content at the Boulder Dam will not exceed on the average 88,000 acre-feet of silt per year. But, even on the basis of the board's estimate, they find that it will take 190 years to fill the reservoir. If there are any additional reservoirs built upstream in the intervening time, of course each additional reservoir would divide the silt burden with the Boulder Dam.

BOARD'S FINDINGS FAVORABLE ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

The board makes a definite, positive, and affirmative finding, as follows:

Although it is clear that difficulties are presented by the drifting sands, it is the opinion of the board that it is feasible to construct, maintain, and successfully operate the canal. The overcoming of these difficulties will affect the cost, which has been allowed for in the estimates. The board believes that the canal should be lined with concrete throughout the sand-dune region and should be given a slope sufficient to carry the inflowing sand to a suitable place for deposit and removal.

For this change the board adds \$7,500,000 to the original estimated cost of the canal of \$31,000,000. However, the board evidently overlooked the study of this same problem in the report of the all-American canal board, which went into the matter very thoroughly and in great detail several years ago. The board designed and estimated a concrete-lined canal throughout the sand-dune region and found that when this was done it would permit of a smaller cross section of the canal and that the cost in either instance would be about the same. The all-American canal board reported that the excavation of about 6,000,000 cubic yards would be saved by this construction, but the saving in cost from this reduction in yardage would be about offset by the cost of the concrete lining.

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN ENGINEERING PLANS

The opponents of this project hail the suggestion of the Sibert Board for certain changes in the Weymouth engineering plans as proof of their contention that there had been inadequate engineering to warrant Congress authorizing the project.

It was never contended that the Weymouth report constituted working plans and specifications on which a contract could be instantly let. His report was just what it purported to be, a report on a proposed project regarding its feasibility, practicability, and an estimate of its cost. Mr. Weymouth himself stated in the report that further studies would be necessary, which would no doubt suggest changes and improvements in the proposed plans. My bill, by an amendment inserted by myself, provided that before the work authorized should be undertaken the proposal should be reviewed by a board of eminent engineers. This is what the Secretary of the Interior would have done, anyway. This is exactly what he did in the case of the San Carlos or Coolidge Dam. It is his practice in the case of all important dams. It has never been the practice, however, that working plans and specifications should be prepared in advance of an authorization by Congress. What I said on this point to the House when my bill was under discussion was that—

the Weymouth report * * * is the most complete and exhaustive study ever made of any project in advance of its authorization by Congress. Certainly the engineering data is more complete than that for the Mississippi flood works recently authorized.

I stand on that statement to-day, and do not feel that there is any occasion to apologize for what I said regarding the Weymouth report.

It should be noted that the Sibert Board does not criticize the Weymouth plans for the Boulder Dam. Nowhere did they say that a dam such as he proposed could not be built or would be unsafe after it was built. What they did say is that in order to be conservative, yea, "ultraconservative"—that is their word—the foundations should be lengthened and additions made to the amount of cement put into the structure. This, of course, adds substantially to the cost of the work.

The board also suggests providing by-pass tunnels for the diversion of the water, with a capacity of 200,000 cubic feet per second instead of the 100,000 feet proposed in the Weymouth report. This adds \$7,500,000 to the estimate.

And, again, to be "ultraconservative" the board suggests a higher unit price for all the work at the dam above the estimate determined by the Reclamation Service, based on actual bids for similar kinds of work.

I do not mean to criticize the action of the board of engineers. I, myself, desire the dam to be made as strong and safe as possible. Whether or not these additions are necessary to insure safety is a matter for the engineers to determine. There will, of course, have to be further studies, because there are not, even now, working plans and specifications on which a contract can be let. The final study will determine how much of this board's recommendations ought to be adopted.

In this connection, I quote A. P. Davis, former president of the American Society of Engineers, and former Chief Engineer and Director of the Reclamation Service, on the question of methods of construction to be used at Boulder Dam, and probable unit prices. He says:

The details of the suggested methods for diverting the river and unwatering the dam site are given in far greater detail in the Weymouth report than is usual in such reports. They were never intended as final, nor as more than suggestive of a basis for judging the feasibility and estimating the cost of such diversion. That is a problem ordinarily solved by the construction engineer or contractor who undertakes the work. Such temporary works usually involve some financial hazard, and the unit estimates are made high enough to cover the contingency of ill fortune. This was the program suggested in the Weymouth report.

If it be decided to increase the size of the tunnels and their number sufficiently to eliminate this risk the large allowance for contingencies to cover that risk becomes unnecessary. The heavy expenditure becomes certain instead of an improbable contingency. In this case, if the cost and number of diversion tunnels be increased, as recommended by the board, then the unit prices for the dam proper should be decreased accordingly.

The estimates of the Weymouth report are \$7 per cubic yard for concrete. Six bids on the San Gabriel Dam, also a large concrete structure, awarded in November, 1928, showed prices of mass concrete, including everything except cement, ranging from \$2.19 to \$2.60 per cubic yard, averaging \$2.365 per cubic yard. Adding the cost of cement will leave the total cost less than \$5 per cubic yard for the concrete.

The Pardee Dam, a large gravity dam now under construction in the canyon of Mokelumne River, is being built at a cost of \$5.85 per cubic yard, including everything.

It is reasonable to estimate that the concrete in Boulder Dam can be placed for about \$6 per cubic yard, or less, if river control is separately provided for. This will largely offset the cost of the extra diversion works, recommended by the board.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is that the Sibert Board?

Mr. SWING. The Sibert Board.

Permit me, also, to quote the comment of Mr. F. E. Weymouth, who is generally admitted to be the best construction engineer the Government ever had, and who built under the cost estimates, what was at the time, the highest dam in the world, the Arrowrock Dam. Regarding the changes in plans for the diversion of water while putting in the foundation, he says:

Many factors should be considered before making any definite decision regarding the type and size of the diversion works, such as the size and frequency of floods, the time required to unwater, excavate, and prepare the foundations, and the time required to build with concrete the permanent upper and lower cofferdams. The expenditures justified for the diversion works must be determined after careful consideration of the above factors. If there is a real probability of being able to unwater, excavate, and prepare the foundations and put in the upper and lower permanent cofferdams between floods, there is no justification for spending money for diversion works that will carry all yearly floods the highest of which occur each June and July. I contend that there is ample time to put in the above between floods and therefore believe there is no justification for building temporary diversion works to carry 200,000 second-feet as recommended by the board.

I believe that it is advisable to be conservative in this matter. I therefore suggested to the board on November 6, 1928, that it would be

well to provide for temporary diversion works for 150,000 second-feet, but not more. The reason for not going above 150,000 second-feet is due to the fact that only two floods have exceeded that amount since records have been kept on the river.

In connection with this last statement, permit me to add that those two floods both happened in the year 1920. As to the increase in cost estimates, Mr. Weymouth says:

There would be some extra costs due to the increased diversion suggested, but this extra cost would be more than offset by the saving in the improvement in dam design that can be made and in the cost of placing the concrete in the dam. In my 1924 report \$7 was allowed per cubic yard for concrete. This cost can easily be cut to \$6 per cubic yard. Recent contracts made by the United States Bureau of Reclamation for the Owyhee Dam and by the county of Los Angeles for the San Gabriel Dam and by others justify the above statements.

ENGINEERING BOARD RECOMMENDS REDUCTION OF PRESSURE PER SQUARE FOOT BELOW PRESENT PRACTICE

The Sibert Board recommends that pressures be reduced in the proposed dam from 40 tons per square foot, as designed, to 30 tons, because the board seems to be of the opinion that 30 tons is as high a pressure as is allowable in the best practice. This opinion is not supported by recent engineering work in dam design, as shown by the following list:

List of pressures on foundations of dams designed or in service

Dam	Type	Material	Height	Pressure in tons
San Gabriel, Calif. ¹	Curved gravity	Concrete	492.5	40.8
Owyhee, Oreg. ¹	do.	do.	405	44.0
Arrowrock, Idaho	do.	Rubble concrete	351	38.4
Exchequer, Calif.	do.	Concrete	325	38.2
Horse Mesa, Ariz.	Constant angle arch.	do.	305	46.8
Roosevelt, Ariz.	Curved gravity	Masonry	260	34.9
Coolidge, Ariz.	Multiple dome	Concrete	250	42.3
Pardee, Calif. ¹	Curved gravity	do.	357	40.0
Melones, Calif.	do.	do.	210	37.8
Calles, Mexico	Constant single arch.	do.	218	52.0
Big Bear Valley, Calif.	Arch	Masonry	61	60.1
Stevenson Creek, Calif.	do.	Concrete	60	72.5

¹ Under construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. Please let me finish.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The gentleman is repudiating the Sibert report.

Mr. SWING. I can not yield.

The designs for the Exchequer, 38.2 tons; Melones, 37.8; Pardee, 40; and the San Gabriel, 40.8, have been approved by the Federal Power Commission.

The Arrowrock Dam in Idaho was completed in 1915, and the reservoir has been filled every year since that date. The list shows that the practice during the past 15 years is to design high dams for pressures of 40 tons or more. None of them have shown any damage from such pressures.

The design of the Arrowrock, Owyhee, Exchequer, and Coolidge Dams was approved by Mr. A. J. Wiley, recognized by the engineering profession as being the foremost authority on high-dam designs in the world to-day. He has recently returned from India, where he went to advise British engineers on the design of dams over 500 feet high.

The San Gabriel Dam, now under construction near the city of Los Angeles, above a densely populated area, will be the highest dam in the world when finished—492.5 feet—and requires more concrete than the proposed Black Canyon Dam.

That dam has been designed with a pressure on the foundation of 40.8 tons. This design was approved by J. B. Lippincott and D. C. Henry, both of them engineers of international as well as national reputation in connection with dam design.

It is true that there has been a progressive increase in recent years in the pressures allowed in the concrete foundations of important structures, but this has not been due to a corresponding reduction in safety requirements. It is due mainly to improvements in quality and strength of concrete made possible by progress in scientific knowledge, and consequent improvements in methods and materials of manufacture. Due to finer grinding, greater uniformity, and other improvements, the quality of cement has gradually improved in the past 20 years. Due to extensive researches by Abrams and others in proportions and methods of mixing, and especially in the quantity of water used, much stronger concrete can be made with given materials than was the practice 10 years ago. Mathematical researches of Cain and others have made computed stresses more certain.

All this progress has been fruitful of results in rendering possible the construction of large works both safer and cheaper than formerly. This accounts for the recent increases in pressures allowed by the most experienced designers of high masonry dams, as shown in the preceding table.

This action is abundantly justified by current tests made during the progress of the work. For example, the concrete placed in the Pardee Dam, now under construction, shows crushing tests on 8-inch cylinders averaging over 180 tons per square foot. In larger masses its resistance would be much higher.

Should it finally be decided to build the dam with only 30 tons pressure on the foundation, as recommended by the board, instead of 40 tons as recommended in the Weymouth report, although 40 tons is well within modern practice, as shown by the many dams now in use with a greater pressure than 40 tons, the cost of the extra concrete and extra excavation could not exceed \$7,000,000.

The extra tunnels recommended by the board to increase the diversion capacity from 100,000 second-feet to 200,000 second-feet could not cost more than \$7,000,000, making an extra cost of \$14,000,000 for these two features. If this extra cost is added to the \$41,500,000 in the Weymouth estimate for the dam, an amount that Lynn Atkinson guarantees to build the dam for, the total cost of the dam would then be \$55,500,000, instead of the \$70,600,000 given in the board report.

At this point permit me to read the telegram of Mr. Lynn Atkinson:

Hon. HIRAM JOHNSON,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Anticipating early passage of Boulder Dam legislation and construction, myself and associates have carefully studied details of Weymouth report and plans, data, and estimates of cost relating to Boulder Canyon Dam construction. Our independent analysis of the cost of constructing of Boulder Dam indicates that the engineers' estimate of cost as set forth in Weymouth report is adequate, and I assure you that myself and associates are prepared to submit a bid and enter into a firm contract covering the construction of the Boulder Canyon Dam as designed and specified in Weymouth report for less than the engineers' estimate as set forth therein. Due to probability of our bidding against other construction companies for this work, it is evident that we would not be justified in revealing our net estimate of cost at this time, and I simply say to you that the engineers' estimate is adequate and that we are prepared to submit a guaranteed bid for this construction work when bids are requested for less than the estimates set forth in the Weymouth report. Boulder Canyon Dam is a rather large project, but not particularly difficult, as gravity dams represent simply mass construction. Weymouth estimate was made several years ago, when prices were higher and labor efficiency lower. Construction methods have been improved upon since Weymouth's estimate was made, and we are constantly lowering our costs by improved methods. We would not adopt exactly the construction methods outlined in Weymouth's report, but our methods of equipment and operation and river control would result in lower costs. Myself and associates are just completing two of the largest dams, and we are thoroughly familiar with costs in both Arizona and California, where we have operated for years.

We are just completing construction of Coolidge Dam for United States Government. This contract was awarded to us less than the engineers' estimate against eight other bidders. Coolidge Dam is located on Gila River in desert locality in southeastern Arizona at a point where floods of over 90,000 second-feet have occurred. Gila River is very comparable to Colorado. We have handled river-control situation here without difficulty and completed contract considerably in advance of contract requirement established by Government engineers. We are also completing largest gravity dam built to date for city of Oakland in northern California on Mokelumne River, almost 400 feet high, known as Pardee or Lancha Plana Dam. Our bid for this work was considerably under engineers' estimate, and I secured contract against four other bidders; and we will complete Pardee Dam in less than two years, as compared with engineers' estimate and contract requirement of five years or over three years ahead of time. No difficulty with river control in spite of fact that we completed foundation work during winter flood season to expedite construction against maximum flow of over 30,000 second-feet. Satisfactory profit being made on this work. Our bids on this work were guaranteed by cash and our contracts guaranteed by corporate surety bond guaranteeing our undertakings to full value of contract price. We perform only public-works contracts and anticipate furnishing 100 per cent bonds to guarantee all of our undertakings as required by law. Working conditions in Arizona are not difficult and we are paying same wages in Arizona as in California, and in some instances less. Coolidge Dam is second dam I have built in Arizona and we are familiar with working conditions.

I recently bid on \$25,000,000 San Gabriel Dam in California and was low bidder on two alternates although fourth bidder on basis on which job was awarded. Competition on San Gabriel contract on which six

bids were received would indicate other firms are figuring lower costs than we do. As a piece of construction Boulder Canyon Dam presents no particularly difficult phases. Engineers' estimate of time of construction is ample. Believe we could build it in less than five years. Should not require over two years to complete foundation work and river control and pouring of concrete in superstructure would require less than two years to complete. We have poured over 60,000 yards of concrete per month in Pardee Dam with relatively small equipment and the plant we have designed for Boulder would be capable of placing over 200,000 yards of concrete per month. Telegram was received by me at Coolidge Dam site in Arizona and full details not at hand, but can advise further upon request.

LYNN ATKINSON,
Coolidge Dam Site.

It is believed that the board's estimate for the power plant and all-American canal is too high in about the same proportion.

COST OF POWER

It was asserted last session that recent improvements in steam turbine and other generating machinery have so reduced the cost of steam power when generated by large units as to make it lower than the estimated cost of hydroelectric power produced by the proposed Boulder Canyon Dam. These claims have been urged partly on the ground of low fuel costs in southern California where oil is abundant. Recent investigations, however, have disproved this claim.

In the Electrical World for October 27, 1928, is given the results of detailed investigations into 16 of the largest modern steam plants in the country. The following table—Table 1—condensed from the Electrical World, shows the total cost per kilowatt-hour of power generated in each of these 16 stations, from which it will be seen that the average cost in practice is 0.853 cent per kilowatt-hour, which is nearly double the cost of delivering the electric current from Boulder Canyon Dam to the cities of southwestern California. Even the cheapest of these shown in the table is substantially higher than the cost of Boulder Canyon power. The first plant in the list is the one that would be most directly in competition with Boulder Canyon power, and shows a cost nearly three times as great as the estimated cost of that power delivered to the same metropolis:

Summary of cost data on representative power stations

Capacity, kilowatt amperes	Number of gener- ators	Dollars per kilovolt ampere			Cents per kilowatt- hour		Total
		Station	Building	Equip- ment	Fixed charge	Total production	
+100,000	3	100	27	71	0.89	0.38	1.27
-50,000	1	128	25	71	.366	.382	.748
-100,000	2	85			.146	.366	.512
-100,000	2	142	39	101	.476	.275	.751
+100,000	3	132	21	71	.424	.227	.651
-100,000	2	130	38	90	.592	.421	1.013
+250,000	4	127	52	71	.436	.478	.914
+200,000	5	121			.613	.343	.956
+300,000	5	81		55	.431	.319	.750
+300,000	2	115	43	70	.458	.216	.674
-50,000	1	106.50	26	63	.576	.35	.926
-50,000	2					.417	
-100,000	2	81	19	46	.341	.337	.678
+50,000	2	110	22	53	.52	.37	.89
-100,000	3	112	30	80	.768	.546	1.314
+100,000	2	144	56	59	.442	.310	.752

Average cost per kilowatt-hour, 0.853 cent.

In this connection permit me to read a telegram from Lester S. Ready, one of the leading authorities on the Pacific coast, on this subject:

The value of electric power in southern California, determined by the cost of power from other sources, particularly steam power, would equal \$8,265,000, for 3,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production, at 55 per cent load factor at Boulder Canyon switchboard, of proposed 1,000,000 horsepower plant. Based on the Colorado River board estimate, with interest during construction, approximating \$122,000,000 for dam and power plant, the total annual cost for interest, amortization, operation, and depreciation, would equal approximately \$7,255,000, assuming amortization during 41 years. This shows leeway of approximately \$1,000,000 annually during amortization period, and nine years prior to the amortization period, for power absorption, which estimates show could be accomplished in approximately four years, by retarding other power developments in anticipation of Boulder power. The revenue from water for domestic purposes would add to the \$1,000,000 leeway. Future possible and probably increase in price of fuel oil over \$1 per barrel, considered herein, would further increase the leeway in the future. It should be noted, also, that hydroelectric power plant

installation costs on Pacific slope is thoroughly well established, and show previous estimate of \$31,500,000, without interest during construction, ample for power plant and that increasing this to \$38,000,000 appears entirely unnecessary.

LESTER S. READY,
Consulting Engineer for State Railroad Commission,
formerly Chief Engineer of State Railroad Commission.

Referring to Mr. Ready's telegram in reference to Black Canyon power:

The \$8,265,000 mentioned is the value of power on the switch-board of the Black Canyon Power Plant—that is, the value of the 3,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours at 2.3 mills. This power is worth around 4.3 mills in Los Angeles. The cost of transmitting the power from Black Canyon to Los Angeles has been deducted from the value at Los Angeles. The price of 2.3 mills is very low. It is very conservative. The Reclamation Service had assumed a price of 3 mills.

The \$122,000,000 capital charge is made up as follows:

Cost of dam and reservoir.....	\$70,600,000
Cost of power plant.....	38,200,000
Interest on the two above items during construction.....	13,200,000

Total.....	122,000,000
------------	-------------

The cost of producing power, based on the engineer board's estimate, would be approximately \$7,250,000. This amount is arrived at as follows:

4 per cent interest on \$122,000,000 capital cost equals.....	\$4,880,000
1 per cent amortization on the whole investment of \$122,000,000.....	1,220,000
Operation and maintenance.....	700,000
Depreciation on the power plant, costing \$31,500,000, at 1 per cent.....	315,000

Total.....	7,115,000
Mr. Ready seems to have added for good measure.....	135,000

Mr. Ready's total.....	7,250,000
------------------------	-----------

Mr. Ready assumes that a period of nine years will accrue before all the power can be sold. This is very conservative. Other well-informed authorities estimate that all the power can be absorbed in five years at the most.

There is a difference of over \$1,000,000 in the cost of production, namely, \$7,250,000, and the sale value of the power, namely, \$8,265,000, which makes the whole proposition very conservative. Also there will be some additional annual increase from the sale of domestic water.

Mr. Ready is of the opinion that the board estimate of \$38,200,000 for the power plant is too high and that the Weymouth estimate of \$31,500,000 is sufficient.

But even if the dam and power plant cost all that the board has estimated, both will be paid for in 41 years with power sold at 2.3 mills.

WATER SUPPLY IS UNDERESTIMATED BY BOARD

The board has expressed the opinion that "the results of Yuma gaugings are at least 10 per cent too high." No reason is given for this opinion except that the methods used in gauging in the early part of the record are less accurate than those later developed and now in use on the Colorado. Some of the improvements in methods of measurement tend to secure larger discharge, but some tend to secure smaller.

The tendency in general is for the errors of the early measurements in the long run to balance each other. The recent methods employed at Lees Ferry and Yuma, since 1921, together with a comparison of the Yuma record of former years with Lees Ferry discharges estimated—in the absence of actual measurements at that point—from upstream gauging stations, indicate that in general the results formerly obtained at Yuma are not too high. In a few years of extremely high discharge they appear somewhat high, and in years of extremely low discharge, too low. If this indication is a correct guide—and it is the best we have—the water conditions are more favorable to power development than those used by the Reclamation Service in the Weymouth report; just the reverse of the conclusions of the Sibert Board.

The board apprehends a cycle of lower flow of the Colorado River than that represented by the 26-year record now available, although this record includes two low stages of the river which are the lowest ever known.

In the spirit of extreme conservatism that is manifest throughout the report, the board concludes that the flow at Black Canyon under the present development is as follows:

	Acres-feet
Average low flow for a period of 15–20 years.....	10,000,000
Average high flow for a similar period.....	14,500,000
Average of high and low periods.....	12,250,000

This average added to the amount now consumed for irrigation in the upper basin, increases it to 15,000,000 acre-feet, the amount apportioned by the Colorado River compact—so that this is not affected.

Even this extreme conclusion, which is about 25 per cent lower than the indications of 26 years' measurement, does not impair the power output, estimated at 550,000 continuous horsepower, which requires only an average of less than 10,000,000 acre-feet of water, which is the average the board adopts for its mythical "low period."

On page 10 of the printed report the Sibert Board marshals the testimony on which it bases its pessimistic conclusions regarding water supply. This consists of nine estimates and averages in and near the basin. Every one of these nine comparisons indicates that the period from 1900 to 1905 was the driest ever known. This period was included in the table, No. 6, on page 5, of Senate Document No. 142, on which the plans for Boulder Dam were based, and so far as this evidence indicates anything it indicates that the period used by the Weymouth report was low and that more abundant supplies may be expected for the future. This is the opinion of such men as Davis, Weymouth, Debler, and others who have given years to the study of the water supply of the Colorado River.

The board, however, in addition to its extreme assumptions of low water, adds another assumption by concluding that rapid irrigation development is to be expected in the upper basin.

This expectation is unwarranted, because the physical and economic conditions are unfavorable for a rapid development in the upper basin. This fact is frankly recognized by people of the upper States, and was the chief reason for their desire to have a compact for the division of water, to protect their water rights for the future, instead of depending on the establishment of their rights by beneficial use, which is sure to be slow.

The board appears to have entirely overlooked the fact that the conditions of extreme drought they have assumed as possible would cause an acute shortage of water in the irrigated upper valleys now developed, and to be developed (the supplies of which are predicated on the records of the past 40 years), and in case of the hypothetical drought more severe and prolonged than any heretofore known, the tributary streams could not possibly furnish for irrigation the amount of water they furnish in normal years, and the subtraction from the flow of the river would be much less than assumed by the board. The shortage would thus be distributed throughout the basin, instead of being concentrated in the lower basin as assumed by the board.

Former Director of the Reclamation Service, Mr. A. P. Davis, believes that even on the extreme conditions of drought assumed by the board, there would be considerable surplus water at all times above that necessary for 550,000 horsepower, and even assuming the coincidence of the hypothetical drought with upstream development, there would be no power shortage, and at all other times there would be large surplus of water.

It should be remembered that the greater the probability of extreme and prolonged drought the greater is the need of a large reservoir capacity to hold the floods of abundant years for use during the drought.

It is interesting to compare the findings of the Sibert Board of Engineers with the findings of another body, the Colorado River Commission, presided over by Herbert Hoover.

The Sibert Board was appointed primarily for the purpose of passing upon engineering plans and were concerned with the quantity of water involved only as an incident to the question of the economic soundness of the project. On the other hand, the Hoover commission was appointed for the express purpose of ascertaining the amount of water which the river produced, because their purpose was to divide the water, and before they could divide it they had to ascertain how much there was to divide. The Hoover commission was made up of the leading water authorities of the seven Colorado River Basin States. They spent a much longer time in their investigations than did the Sibert Board, and the conclusions the Hoover commission arrived at, as expressed by him, were set forth in the House hearings in 1923. Mr. Hoover there said:

The unapportioned surplus is estimated at from 4,000,000 to 6,000,000 acre-feet, but may be taken as approximately 5,000,000 acre-feet.

This shows that the "ultraconservative" findings of the Sibert Board will in all probability never be realized.

The board throughout its report adheres radically to its announced policy of being conservative, even to the extent of being "ultraconservative." I do not criticize this, but I believe Congress should appreciate the rather extreme limits to which the board has gone in order to be ultraconservative.

The board assumes for construction purposes there will be in the next few years the highest water in the river of which we have any record, and yet for revenue purposes the board assumes that we are now entering a cycle of extremely dry years. The board estimates the run-off of the river in the past

26 years at less than what the actual records show it to be, and then in discussing the possible power output assume the future will be less productive of water than what they say has been in the river during the past 26 years. They assume further that there will be "relatively rapid development" in the upper-basin States, and not only that the upper-basin States will use their allotted share" but, more, that the upper States may even violate the terms of the Colorado River compact in the quantity of water abstracted from the river. I have already pointed out that the board adds to the cost and quantity of tunnels for by-passing water during construction and adds to the quantity and unit price of cement, and yet in the face of it all they find with certain modifications of the financial plan that the dam and power plant will pay for itself within the time limit named in the bill.

The board has estimated the cost at \$165,000,000, but that does not necessarily mean that it will actually cost that amount.

However, it has been deemed advisable to amend the bill to cover the board's figure, and that has been done in the Senate.

But, if we assume that the price of \$165,000,000 for the dam and power plant is what these structures are to cost, how does this compare with the earnest assertions of the opponents of the project last session?

I find that the gentleman from Arizona, on page 32 of his report, told the House—

that at the expiration of 50 years the Federal Government will have in the Boulder Canyon project a net investment of \$322,585,644.

But as his report proceeds his figures mount because, on page 37 of his report, he says:

Even if the cost of this project be correct the Federal Government can not be reimbursed for its expenditures. * * * The Federal Government at the expiration of the 50 years of amortization will have upon its hands instead of an amortized project one in which the total net investment will have amounted to over one-half billion dollars.

This is as far removed from the figure of \$165,000,000 declared by the board to be ultraconservative as the sun is from the moon.

If, however, on final review it is determined by the engineers in charge of the actual construction that 150,000 cubic second-foot capacity for tunnels would be a reasonable provision for the diversion of water during the construction of the foundation, and if it should be found that 35 tons pressure per square foot is safe conservative practice, then the suggested increase of \$40,000,000 to the cost of the project will have by those two items alone been cut into half. Further, if the unit price of the cost of production is taken to be that which is being actually bid and contracted for to-day instead of the ultraconservative high unit price assumed by the board, then the remaining 20,000,000 addition will again be cut approximately in two.

But if, as has been suggested by the Sibert Board, the cost of the all-American canal is charged wholly and directly against the lands benefited and this provision has already been made by amendment in the Senate, then, even assuming the Sibert Board estimate of the cost of dam and power plants, still the project will pay out well within the time limit named in the bill, as was shown by the Ready analysis of the board's figures.

Under our bill the communities interested in the Southwest will put up contracts for \$165,000,000, if it costs that much, and every dollar of it will be paid back to the United States. [Applause.]

To show that the Reclamation Service estimates on dam construction have been reliable, I insert the following table.

ESTIMATES OF COST

The following table gives the actual costs and estimates of cost made by the Reclamation Service for all the dams built by that service over 50 feet high:

Estimated and actual costs for all Bureau of Reclamation dams 50 feet or more in height

Dam	Project	Maximum height (feet)	Estimated cost	Actual cost
Owyhee	Owyhee	405	\$5,243,000	\$4,947,716
Arrowrock ¹	Boise	349	6,250,000	4,327,710
Shoshone	Shoshone	328	1,021,000	1,439,135
Elephant Butte ²	Rio Grande	306	5,000,000	5,004,216
Roosevelt	Salt River	280	3,750,000	3,890,187
Tieton ³	Yakima	222	4,020,000	3,756,256
Pathfinder ⁴	North Platte	218	11,000,000	1,794,366

¹ Based on contract prices—construction recently started.

² Dam and reservoir.

³ Estimate was for dam raising water surface 190 feet; after construction began, plans were changed and dam built for 220-foot raise of water surface.

⁴ No detailed estimate found, but early board reports show \$1,000,000 allowed for Pathfinder Reservoir.

⁵ Increase partly due to the building of an additional outlet tunnel, and changes made in north tunnel, both together amounting to \$641,000.

Estimated and actual costs for all Bureau of Reclamation dams 50 feet or more in height—Continued

Dam	Project	Maximum height (feet)	Estimated cost	Actual cost
Black Canyon	Boise	183	1,800,000	1,243,889
Gibson	Sun River	179	1,826,000	1,566,240
McKay	Umatilla	160	2,500,000	2,116,828
East Park	Orland	139	198,000	196,120
Sun River Diver	Sun River	132	145,000	149,366
Hubbart	Flathead	131	308,000	362,653
Echo	Salt Lake Basin	130	1,395,000	1,125,098
Lahontan	Newlands	124	1,425,000	1,324,782
Belle Fourche	Belle Fourche	122	1,040,000	1,259,515
Stony Gorge	Orland	120	610,000	518,904
Guernsey	North Platte	100	1,780,000	1,700,351
Cold Springs	Umatilla	98	358,000	443,665
Minidoka	Minidoka	86	430,000	509,683
Gerber	Klamath	85	341,000	336,241
Clear Creek	Yakima	84	108,000	136,187
Sherburne Lakes	Milk River	83	400,000	359,683
American Falls ⁵	Minidoka	78	8,500,000	7,300,000
Willow Creek	Sun River	73		(15)
Strawberry	Strawberry	72	262,000	271,724
Upper Deer Flat	Boise	70	329,000	325,675
Heechelus	Yakima	70	1,337,000	1,892,778
Willwood	Shoshone	70	362,000	352,948
Jackson Lake ¹⁶	Minidoka	67	800,000	782,046
Conconully	Okanogan	67	254,000	283,175
Easton ¹⁸	Yakima	65	6,271,000	7,231,947
Minatare	North Platte	63	590,000	522,538
Kachess ¹	Yakima	63	712,000	661,000
Lake McDonald	Flathead	57	242,000	234,085
McMillan	Carlsbad	55		(19)
Ralston	Shoshone	50		(20)
Avalon	Carlsbad	50	162,000	215,989
Total, 38			55,378,000	51,782,696

¹ Dam and reservoir.

² Estimate was for dam raising water surface 190 feet; after construction began, plans were changed and dam built for 220-foot raise of water surface.

³ Dam now under construction. Figures represent engineer's estimate of cost of principal construction. Do not include gates, cement, or other accessories and materials furnished by the United States.

⁴ Contract price.

⁵ Failure of contractors delayed work two years, and this, together with additional construction of a gravel berm and installation of auxiliary valves, increased the estimated cost.

⁶ Original estimate did not include item for general expense, amounting to \$55,600.

⁷ Subsequent improvements, not included in original plans, have brought the cost up to \$625,841.

⁸ Change in location of dam due to conditions revealed after construction began occasioned increase in excavation and concrete quantities.

⁹ Dam only, exclusive of outlet works and spillway.

¹⁰ Actual cost of present structure, \$235,537. Original estimate, \$536,000, but this was for a dam 40 feet higher than was finally constructed. No estimate found for lower dam.

¹¹ Modified by board report of Dec. 16, 1913, to \$1,337,000.

¹² Difficulty of obtaining suitable material increased cost by \$240,000. Other changes which greatly increased the original estimate were rip-rapping, inclusion of concrete cut-off wall, changes in tunnel scheme, increased excavation for spillway and heavier concrete lining, additional road construction and clearing and logging reservoir—the latter item alone costing \$290,000.

¹³ Enlargement of existing reservoir.

¹⁴ Beginning of construction disclosed unsatisfactory foundation conditions and dam was relocated 3,300 feet upstream, involving increase in volume and extensive changes in plans for outlet work and spillway. Subsequent enlargement brings total cost to \$324,734.

¹⁵ Including section of main canal just below dam.

¹⁶ Dam purchased from Pecos Irrigation Co., repaired and enlarged; no estimates found.

¹⁷ Dam was part of Garland Division canal system and no separate estimate for the dam appears to have been made.

¹⁸ Increase due to use of concrete core wall instead of sheet piling, two new tunnels to increase spillway capacity, and an additional spillway of reinforced concrete. These changes cost over \$100,000.

This table shows that on an average these structures have been built substantially cheaper than the estimated cost. Particulars are given in the footnotes.

It should be remembered that always the estimates preceded the construction, and in most cases this interval was several years. Also that estimates were necessarily based on experience of previous years, so that the construction always followed from 5 to 10 years after the experience on which estimates were based. Any change in prices in this interval would influence the ratio of estimate and cost.

The trend of prices from 1896 to 1926, the period involved in the operations covered by the table, was decidedly upward, the prices for 1926 being more than double those for 1896. This general rise of prices sometimes involves costs far above those of previous years on which estimates were necessarily based, and this largely accounts for the cases in which the costs exceeded the estimates. The fact that in general and on the average they did not shows that as a rule such estimates were liberal.

THE "VESTRIS" DISASTER AND THE SHIPPING LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] will be recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen and ladies of the House, it is my purpose this morning to talk about our shipping laws. I want to call attention to the confused, antiquated, obsolete, and ineffective laws that govern our Steamboat Inspection Service and the laws under which the Government of the United States derives its jurisdiction and power to inspect steamers and protect the safety of passengers at sea. I will also touch on the question of the limitation of liability of shipowners granted to them under an archaic law which should have no place in our statutes. Unfortunately, it requires a great disaster, the loss of many lives, or a tragedy of some sort, to arouse public opinion and perhaps even to move legislators into a study of the situation and the need of reform. At any rate, we should at least profit by the experience of the past and as some unforeseen tragedy or disaster happens, see to it if it can in any way be prevented in the future. Members will remember the sinking of the *Titanic* with the loss of over a thousand lives.

Many will remember that following several investigations, some legislation, and changes in ship inspection, regulations followed. I am sure that disaster also spurred naval architects to study and bring about structural changes in the building of big ships. The steamer *Eastland*, which sank right at the dock in Chicago, was another instance which brought home the necessity of bringing our Steamboat Inspection Service up to date. In that case the service did change or improve its work and revise its regulations, and although many recommendations were made to Congress very little of anything was done in the way of enacting necessary legislation.

Now we come to the last tragedy of the sea, the sinking of the British steamer *Vestris*. No accident at sea has ever been more shocking. Not a child was saved. Large percentage of the women passengers were lost. The percentage of the crew who were saved is out of all proportions of the percentage of the passengers saved. From the information that we have to-day obtained from witnesses, some of them officers of the ship, I believe it is universally agreed, that the handling of the ship and the seamanship displayed was far short of even an average standing. It is not my purpose to-day to go into detail concerning the sinking of the *Vestris*. It is not my purpose to fix the blame. That is not our function. It is my purpose to take the *Vestris* as a ship, her rights under the law, the inspection to which she was submitted, and the laws under which such inspections were made as an example to show the necessity of a complete revision of our laws on this subject. Not only the necessity of the revision of the law but the necessity of prompt action, prompt action as soon as a thorough study of this involved and technical subject will permit.

The *Vestris* was an old-type ship with a very low factor of safety. Although it might have been known that she was not a safe ship, I do not believe that under the existing law it would have been possible for United States officials to prevent her in engaging in the passenger trade. It is apparent that the ship lacked stability. A great deal has been said on the question of stability of late, and I find that the term is very often misunderstood. The matter of stability in a ship is fundamental in considering her safety. In fact, the entire consideration in the building of the hull is given to the principal point of stability. For this purpose I have brought here a model of a "one-compartment" ship similar in general construction to the *Vestris*. I have here the plans of the last type, I might say of the best type, of safe passenger steamers, the steamship *Malolo*. Just what is meant by "one compartment" I will take up in a minute.

To return to stability. The stability of a ship is not what is generally believed by a passenger. It does not mean that a ship with the greatest stability is the ship that rolls the least. Stability simply means the ability of a ship to right itself whenever she does roll or is listed to one or the other side. To take a simple illustration, a canoe has very little stability. While it glides along smoothly and rolls very little, once that a wave puts it over to one side or she rolls over she capsizes very easily. A raft has great stability. It is difficult to push it over, and if in choppy weather it will roll most uncomfortably but always comes back to an even keel. Now gentlemen, here is what is known as the keel of the ship [indicating]. This deck on the model [indicating] in this particular ship is the main or strength deck. The keel and the strength deck are the two principal units of a ship. They may be compared to the foundation and keystone of an arch building.

Stability is obtained by proper and correct proportions of the draft [indicating] which, as you know, is the portion of the ship under the water line, and the beam [indicating] of the ship at midship, naturally, everything being in proportion and accurately calculated. One rough way of determining the stability of a ship, assuming always that the center of gravity is correct and properly placed, is to take the square of the beam

and divide it by the draft. The higher the quotient the higher the degree of stability. I need not point out, of course, that the superstructure on the deck and its general construction all enter in determining the center of gravity. I referred to this model being a "1-compartment" ship. That means that the ship is divided, as you can see, into several compartments. This model is made so that the inside of the ship may be seen. [Opens side of ship and indicates.] Here, gentlemen, are the bulkheads dividing the ship into several compartments. A bulkhead in the language of the landlubber is a crosswise partition dividing the ship into water-tight compartments. In other words, here [indicating] is a bulkhead. Here is another. This space in between is a compartment and supposed to be water-tight. The doors in between bulkheads, especially the doors in the midship section in modern ships, are closed by a main control from the bridge [indicating]. Now, if a ship collides or springs a leak in the case of a ship like this—1-compartment ship—that means that if one compartment is flooded she can still float. That is to-day a ship of very low safety. In fact, no 1-compartment ship should be permitted to carry passengers. The *Vestris* was a 1-compartment ship, and there is a question if she was even that. But I will return to that in a minute. Now, here, gentlemen, is the diagram of the last word in safety in passenger-vessel construction. It is the diagram of the American steamer *Malolo*. Here you have a sectional diagram and you will see that there are no less than 12 compartments. Right here [indicating] we have the diagram of the main deck.

I want to call your attention [indicating] to the structure of this main deck, as I will have occasion to refer to main-deck structure later on. This curve on this diagram here [indicating] will show you the floatability of the *Malolo*. She can be called a 4-compartment ship. Now should the ship collide or spring a leak anywhere around her midship section [indicating] this ship can float with no less than four compartments flooded. If she should break or spring a leak aft or in her bow [indicating], she can float with three compartments flooded. You can readily see by comparing the structures of the two ships the progress that has been made in the art of shipbuilding. Yet our law to-day on the subject was made when this old-type ship [indicating model] was the last word in shipbuilding construction and while all this improvement has been made and progress achieved from 1870 to date, nearly 60 years, we have not changed our laws at all. I want to point out, gentlemen, that the safety and floatability of the *Malolo* is not only theoretical. It so happened that on her trial trip she was rammed right square midship by a Norwegian barge. She was hit right here [indicating], right between her two boiler sections, a terrible gash put into her side under the water line. Both boiler rooms were immediately flooded and put out of commission. She could not generate a pound of steam, but there was no danger at any time, and she kept afloat as if nothing had happened. She was finally towed into port and the repairs necessary were only slight. Even that experience brought a lesson to naval architects and ships built in this country since then have the two boiler rooms separated with one water-tight compartment in between. Such up-to-date ships, for instance, as the steamships *California* and *Virginia*.

Having seen how important to the safety of the ship and to the security of her passengers are the proper construction of the hull and the stability of the ship, the necessity of proper supervision over such construction and proper stability backed by statutory requirements can not be denied. Yet, gentlemen, the law on this subject was enacted prior to 1870. The Steamboat Inspection Service, the Government agency charged with the inspection of all vessels, can only inspect a ship after she is completed. There is nothing in the law which permits a supervision of the plans or gives the Government any say as to the construction of the hull. The minimum requirements of the law read in this day and age is simply laughable. Let me read section 4490 of the Revised Statutes, and to say that that is the only section in the law governing the subject of hull construction and subsequent hull inspection. While the regulations, it is true, are written by the Secretary of Commerce, as everyone knows, they can not go beyond the scope or limit of the statute itself:

SEC. 4490. Every sea-going steamer, and every steamer navigating the great northern or northwestern lakes, carrying passengers, the building of which shall be completed after the 28th day of August, 1871, shall have not less than three water-tight cross bulkheads, such bulkheads to reach to the main deck in single-decked vessels, otherwise to the deck next below the main deck; to be made of iron plates, sustained upon suitable framework; and to be properly secured to the hull of the vessel. The position of such bulkheads and the strength of material of which the same shall be constructed shall be determined by the general rules of the board of supervising inspectors.

The Steamboat Inspection Service has repeatedly asked Congress to amend this section and to bring the law up to date. I am sorry to note that for 18 years Congress has ignored this plea. What happens now? A ship is inspected and entitled to a certificate if she can navigate the waters she sails. A mere reference to the statute referring to a ship built prior to 1870 as a requirement under the law shows the obsolescence of the statute. To require a minimum of three water-tight cross bulkheads indicates how far behind the law is to the present school of shipbuilding. Examinations are now conducted by local inspectors. There is no centralization. Local inspectors are practical men. They qualify as practical men, and they are paid as such. They are not technicians; they are not naval architects. Their qualifications are limited; their duties are limited, and on the whole they have performed their duties very well, and considering the limitation of the law, satisfactorily. The law as to boiler inspection is broader and gives the service greater jurisdiction and power of inspection, but even the boiler law is not centralized. The Steamboat Inspection Service has also called attention of Congress to the necessity of the revision of these sections of the law. Repeatedly, as I will read to you in a few minutes, has the Steamboat Inspection Service urged these changes, and again I will say Congress has not heeded and nothing has been done by Congress to provide the necessary legislation. Here I will read section 4418 of the Revised Statutes, and I want to call attention of the House that it was amended by an act approved March 3, 1905:

SEC. 4418. The local inspectors shall also inspect the boilers and their appurtenances in all steam vessels before the same shall be used, and once at least in every year thereafter, and shall subject all boilers to the hydrostatic pressure. All such vessels shall comply with the following requirements, namely: That the boilers are well made, of good and suitable material; that the openings for the passage of water and steam, respectively, and all pipes and tubes exposed to heat are of proper dimensions and free from obstructions; that the spaces between and around the flues are sufficient; that flues, boilers, furnaces, safety valves, fusible plugs, low-water indicators, feed-water apparatus, gauge cocks, steam gauges, water and steam pipes connecting boilers, means of prevention of sparks and flames from fire doors, low-water gauges, means of removing mud and sediment from boilers, and all other such machinery and appurtenances thereof, are of such construction, shape, condition, arrangement, and material that the same may be safely employed in the service proposed without peril to life; and the local inspectors shall satisfy themselves by thorough examination that said requirements of law and regulations in regard thereto have been fully complied with. All boilers used on steam vessels and constructed of iron or steel plates, inspected under the provisions of sections 4430, shall be subjected to a hydrostatic test in the ratio of 150 pounds to the square inch to 100 pounds to the square inch of the working steam power allowed. No boiler or flue pipe, nor any of the connections therewith, shall be approved which is made, in whole or in part, of bad material or is unsafe in its form or dangerous from defective workmanship, age, use, or other cause.

It will be noted that in the case of the boilers—this, I believe, was brought about by the amendment of 1905—provides for an inspection and test of the boilers before they are used. It also defines specifically minimum requirements of boiler plates, the necessary pressure, all of which gives the Steamboat Inspection Service the right to make inspections and examinations not only of the boilers before they are used but of the material that goes into the making of the boiler. The regulations provide fully for the inspection of the plates and material at the factory and of stamping such material after it has been approved. But, gentlemen, even that is not sufficient. Under the law these examinations are entirely in the hands of the local inspectors. They carry on the examinations, inspections within their own districts. There is no centralization. There should be a central office properly equipped with a personnel of technically trained experts to pass upon the plans, construction, and material of these boilers in order to bring about uniformity of inspection throughout the country and also to have men who are qualified to pass upon these highly technical and specialized subjects. This suggestion for centralization of boiler inspection and hull inspection such as I have indicated is by no means original with me, or novel. It had been urged by the Steamboat Inspection Service for over 15 years. I am going to read, at the risk of boring you, extracts from the report of the Supervising Inspector General for the year 1915. In this report he not only urges revision and amendments to the law but he quotes from previous reports as far back as 1910, stressing the necessity for legislation on this subject. Kindly pay attention to the recommendations made in 1915 and to the review of previous recommendations from the Steamboat Inspection Service made to Congress, and which to date, I repeat

again, Congress has failed to act. In 1915, Mr. Uhle, the then Supervising Inspector General of the Steamboat Inspection Service, in his annual report said:

HULL INSPECTION

Though occurring in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, it is not inappropriate to refer in this report to certain criticisms that have been made of the service in connection with the *Eastland* disaster. Despite the many untruths that have been told and the gross amount of misrepresentations made, either intelligently or through ignorance, hull inspection is something that has received the serious attention of this bureau. Under the provisions of section 4417, Revised Statutes, the local inspectors are required, once in every year at least, to carefully inspect the hull of each steam vessel within their respective districts, and satisfy themselves that every such vessel so submitted to their inspection is of a structure suitable for the service in which she is to be employed, etc. Under authority conferred by this statute, the local inspectors have the right to refuse to certificate a vessel they do not believe is of suitable structure. Nevertheless, it has never been held that the board of supervising inspectors has authority to lay down in detail structural tests in the same manner as has been done in the case of boiler construction, express authority in the case of boilers having been conferred by certain statutes applicable thereto. It may be interesting to review in this connection certain remarks and recommendations that have been made by this office in previous annual reports in regard to hull inspection.

Attention is called to the remarks under the heading "Hull inspection," appearing on page 15 of the Annual Report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910, which reads as follows:

"For some time it has been required that the manufacturers of boilers submit to the local inspectors blue prints showing in detail the proposed construction of the boiler or boilers which they are about to build. Inspectors have thereby been enabled to ascertain whether the boilers are to be constructed in conformity with the requirements of the general rules and regulations and of the United States statutes upon which those rules and regulations are based, and before approving such blue prints they frequently confer with the boiler manufacturers and point out to them the defects, if any.

"This service is of opinion that the time has now come when blue prints of hull construction should also be submitted, not with a view to imposing unnecessary burdens upon shipbuilders and the owners of steam vessels, but in order that the inspectors may know whether the hulls of the vessels proposed to be built are to be constructed in accordance with safe practice. At present the inspectors of hulls ascertain exactly whether the necessary life-saving and fire-fighting equipment is aboard the boat, whether the fire hose is in a good condition, whether the necessary life preservers are on board and in good condition, and other matters relating to the hull inspection of a vessel, but having ascertained all of this they are often still in ignorance as to the details of the original construction of the hull.

"An important item of information with which inspectors should be furnished when the hull of a steamer is built is the thickness of the material and the size and weight of the scantling used in the construction thereof, for it is well known that there is a general deterioration of hulls, with the result that as the years go by and the vessels go from one district to another, the inspectors really have to depend absolutely upon surface indications as to the condition of the hull. The condition of a steel or iron hull is ascertained by the hammer test and general indications, and of wooden hulls by boring, scraping, etc. Anyone familiar with hull construction knows that quantities of rust accumulate on the inside of the iron or steel hull, if not properly cared for, with the result that each year the material of such a hull becomes thinner, while the wooden hull softens and rots. If inspectors were furnished with detailed information regarding the original construction of a hull, they would then be accurately informed as to just how much the vessel had deteriorated since her construction. It is therefore proposed to submit to you for approval a bill which will make necessary a more detailed hull inspection than that heretofore prevailing."

While it was stated in the last sentence of the above quotation that it was proposed to submit to you a bill that would make necessary a more detailed hull inspection than that heretofore prevailing, it was finally decided when the matter came before the board of supervising inspectors for consideration that the first steps to be taken in this respect might better be in the form of a regulation requiring that the blue prints of the hulls of certain vessels be submitted to the inspectors, not for approval, but for their information.

Reference again was made to this matter in the paragraph headed "Effect of hull inspection," on page 14 of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, which reads as follows:

"In my annual report to you for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910, I recommended a more rigid and thorough hull inspection, and at the last meeting of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of Steam Vessels, in January, 1911, a rule was passed requiring vessels of a certain ton-

nage to submit blue prints showing their construction and other information of value to the inspectors, and it is believed that it will become more and more apparent that the rule above referred to is a good one, for prior to the passage of that rule inspectors of this service were in complete ignorance of many essential things they should know regarding the construction of hulls of vessels inspected by them."

Attention is also invited to the first paragraph appearing under the heading "Activities of the service," on page 14 of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912, which reads as follows:

"In connection with the work of the service it may be interesting to note the manner of hull inspection. An examination of the Rules and Regulations Prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors shows that there has been developed in great detail the matter of boiler inspection and construction, but it having become more and more apparent every year that the service must give more attention to hull inspection, at the annual meeting of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of Steam Vessels in January, 1911, a resolution was introduced requiring that the owners of every new vessel of over 100 gross tons when making application for the first inspection of the vessel must furnish the local inspectors of the district where the vessel is to be inspected a drawing or blue print, in plan and section, showing fully the general construction of the vessel, of wood, iron, or steel, including dimensions, spacing of frames, disposition of hull plates, outside and in, or of outside and inside planks, construction of decks, construction of transverse and longitudinal bulkheads and location of same, space between decks, and details of principal scarfs, and must also furnish a statement of the shapes, dimensions, and unit weights of all structural parts of the hull, and of the kinds of material of which made, including kinds of wood. The resolution also provided that a full description of the riveting of all parts of an iron or steel hull must be furnished. The result of that resolution, which was adopted by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, has been most beneficial, and now inspectors have in their possession certain valuable information of which they were in complete ignorance prior to the passage of the rule. It will thus be seen that even before a vessel is built the service makes an effort to see that it is in fact properly constructed."

Attention is also invited to the paragraph appearing under the heading "Classification for hull inspection," on page 17 of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912, which reads as follows:

"It becomes more apparent each year that there should be some classification for hull inspection, and there is no reason why there should not be an American standard of construction. At the present time the American Bureau of Shipping, closely allied with and supported by ship-owners, shipbuilders, and marine insurers, is the only standard that we have in this country. The Board of Supervising Inspectors should now examine the rules of the American Bureau of Shipping and suggest such changes as seem desirable and also suggest some basis of cooperation with this American standard of construction. It should be a matter of pride that America should have a standard classification for hull construction that may be spoken of as the standard authority in this country, and the Board of Supervising Inspectors is the body that should formulate the rules for that American standard. It is believed that under sections 4405 and 4417, Revised Statutes, the Board of Supervising Inspectors has ample authority to undertake this work."

While in the last sentence of the quotation above the statement is made that it is believed that under sections 4405 and 4417, Revised Statutes, the Board of Supervising Inspectors has ample authority to undertake this work, it was concluded by the Board of Supervising Inspectors after due deliberation and discussion that sufficient authority did not exist for the approval of hull construction and for requiring certain detailed tests in regard to construction.

The bureau desires to refer also to the first two paragraphs appearing under the heading "Hull inspection," commencing on page 16 of its annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, which read as follows:

"Reference has been made to the fact that under the rules of the Board of Supervising Inspectors blue prints descriptive of the hull construction of certain vessels are required to be filed with the local inspectors having jurisdiction, but, as has already been pointed out, it is not at present required that these blue prints be approved by the local inspectors with whom they are filed. Some thought has been given the question of whether it would not be advisable to require these blue prints to be approved by the Steamboat Inspection Service, but such approval not to be given by the local inspectors. It is believed instead that there should be stationed in the office of the Supervising Inspector General a corps of experts whose business it would be to approve the proposed hull construction. This, it is thought, is necessary (1) because it would enable the department to employ experts who are more familiar with hull construction than the local inspectors and (2) it would result in that uniform administration of the law with which the Supervising Inspector General is charged.

"To adopt such a system as this might require the enactment of a statute that would give this express authority to the Steamboat Inspec-

tion Service, or if it should be determined that there is sufficient law to justify this action, certainly it would require a larger appropriation for the employment of experts for the purpose named. Furthermore, it would be a distinct departure from the principles that have heretofore governed the Steamboat Inspection Service in the matter of the approval of certain things by local inspectors, as it would place that approving power in the central office, thereby relieving the local inspectors of much responsibility, as well as obtaining more expert advice and a more uniform administration of the law. This is a matter requiring careful consideration. It is not one to be adopted without mature deliberation, but it is a question that faces this service to-day and which will as time goes on require more and more attention."

It will be noted that the idea which the bureau has had in mind has been to create in the office of the Supervising Inspector General a corps of experts, whose business it would be to approve proposed hull construction. In order to do this it will be necessary, in the opinion of the Supervising Inspector General, to amend certain statutes that at present exist that place in the hands of local inspectors original jurisdiction with regard to hull inspection. If the construction of a vessel could be approved by experts stationed in the office of the Supervising Inspector General, there would result not only safe conditions with reference to construction but there would also result more uniformity in the matter of correct inspection and construction, and it is to be recalled that the Supervising Inspector General is charged with a uniform enforcement of the law. It would also be necessary to have a much larger appropriation than at present, not only to pay the salaries of the experts to be employed but also to pay the salaries of many additional clerks required in the central office and for the salaries also of inspectors of construction, who should be stationed in all of the shipyards throughout the country.

Thus it will be seen that unfortunate as was the disaster to the steamer *Eastland* the matter of hull inspection and construction is one that has not been neglected, and it may be that as a result of this terrible disaster it will be possible to obtain a sufficiently large appropriation to pay for the additional expenditure above proposed, which would result in a larger and more effective service.

OVERLOADING OF PASSENGER STEAMERS

Closely connected with the proposition of hull construction is that of the overloading of passenger steamers. To one who gives this subject only superficial attention the first thought is, Has a steamer carried more passengers than she is permitted to carry by her certificate of inspection? It is believed, however, that violations of law in this respect are comparatively few, and the more important question to ask is, Have the local inspectors permitted a steamer to carry a larger number of passengers than she should be permitted to carry by her certificate of inspection? In this connection it is to be borne in mind not only does the ship possess sufficient stability to carry the number of passengers allowed, but in giving the passenger allowance has due consideration been given to the possibility of panic and to the handling of the life-saving apparatus in the event of panic?

It will be interesting in this connection to refer to previous annual reports in regard to the question of overloading, and attention is called to the remarks appearing under the heading "Overloading of passenger steamers," commencing on page 19 of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912, which read as follows:

"The matter of the number of persons permitted to be carried on passenger steamers is one that has received the careful and constant attention of this bureau.

"Section 4464, Revised Statutes, requires inspectors to state in every certificate of inspection granted to steamers carrying passengers, other than ferryboats, the number of passengers that any such steamer has accommodations for, or can carry with prudence and safety. It will thus be seen that the local inspectors have exclusive jurisdiction in the matter of fixing the number of passengers that shall be carried on board steamers. This perhaps is as it should be, for as a result of varying local conditions the local inspectors are the ones who are presumably best informed as to the number of passengers a steamer can carry with safety. At the same time, however, if the local inspectors do not exercise good judgment, steamers will be permitted to carry more persons than they should be allowed. The bureau has persistently endeavored to have the local inspectors watch most carefully this situation, impressing upon them that the responsibility is theirs, and that in the event of disaster from this cause they will most surely suffer the punishment that is proper for any carelessness or neglect of duty. If it were possible or practicable to have a general and uniform rule by which the passenger allowance could be estimated, it would be most desirable, but at the present time I can not see how such a rule could be put into effect.

"It is believed, however, that the new rules in regard to the boating of vessels will very materially control the situation, for now that vessels are required to boat according to the number of passengers carried, and not according to tonnage, an unreasonably large number of passengers can not be carried because of the inability of the steamers to boat up to the requirements."

There was also issued in the year 1912 a very important circular letter, dated April 27, 1912, addressed to United States supervising local inspectors of the service in regard to this matter. Particular attention is invited to the last paragraph of this letter:

"As the season approaches when water travel will be at its height, you are directed to give particular and careful attention to the matter of the inspection and equipment of all steamers under your jurisdiction, especially those steamers accommodating a large complement of people. You must see that all of the life-saving apparatus, such as life preservers, lifeboats, and life rafts, is in first-class condition, a conclusion that must be reached only by actual personal examination on the part of the local or assistant inspectors.

"Hose, pumps, fire extinguishers, etc., must be carefully examined by a local or assistant inspector to determine that the fire-fighting apparatus is in good condition, and ready for immediate use.

"Another matter, to which most careful consideration must be given, and one that has had the attention of this bureau, is that of passenger allowances on excursion steamers. It is impossible to lay down any iron-clad rule as to how many passengers shall be allowed on a steamer, for some steamers, by reason of their construction and stability, are able to carry more persons than other steamers that may actually have more deck space. In arriving at the passenger allowance you should have in mind not only the stability of the ship but also the possibility of panic in case of disaster. If the passenger allowance of excursion steamers invites any doubt whatever, do not hesitate to cut down such allowance, for you are aware that you are responsible, and will be held responsible, in the event of disaster to such boats."

Reference is also made here to a part of the statement appearing under the heading "Precautions against overloading of passenger steamers," commencing on page 14 of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, and reading as follows:

"The bureau has always made an earnest effort to prevent the overloading of steamers carrying passengers, and it is believed that it has succeeded in greatly reducing this practice. There are two factors to be considered in the matter of the number of passengers that steamers are permitted to carry. The first is, Have the inspectors permitted the vessel by her certificate of inspection to carry more passengers than she can safely accommodate? and second, Have the officers of the vessel permitted more passengers to be carried than is allowed by her certificate of inspection? Under section 4464, Revised Statutes, the inspectors are required to state in every certificate of inspection granted to steamers carrying passengers, other than ferryboats, the number of passengers of each class that any such steamer has accommodations for and can carry with prudence and safety, and thus it will be seen that local inspectors have exclusive jurisdiction in the matter of fixing the number of passengers that may be carried on board steamers. In a country such as ours, with so many varied local conditions and so many different types of vessels, this is probably the best arrangement that can be made; but the judgment of all men is not the same, and one inspector may err in permitting a steamer to carry more passengers than its capacity justifies, whereas another may err in not permitting a steamer to carry as many passengers as might be safely and prudently allowed. If it were possible to have a general and uniform rule by which passenger allowance could be estimated, it would be most desirable, but under the varying conditions it is practically impossible to put such a rule in effect. The bureau, however, has repeatedly warned local inspectors that the responsibility is theirs and that they would be held responsible in the event of disaster, and it is believed that these warnings and instructions have had a good effect. There is one factor, however, by which the allowance of passengers has been substantially controlled, and that is the rules at present in force in regard to lifeboat equipment, for where steamers are boated according to the number of passengers carried they are restricted in their passenger allowance by the extent of their equipment, and consequently can not carry a larger number of passengers than justified by their lifeboat capacity.

"The matter of preventing steamers from carrying more passengers than allowed by their certificates of inspection has received particular attention during the present season, and a system of having inspectors actually count passengers and submit reports direct to this office on small cards has been instituted and soon will be in general use by inspectors of this service and by customs inspectors. This will enable the department to be in immediate and close touch with the counting of passengers on steamers and do much to prevent overloading. It is believed that the counting of passengers should be entirely under the control of the inspectors of this service, which, of course, would require additional inspectors, because the small number at present available would not be able to take care of this very large and important business.

"In this connection I desire to call your attention to the recommendation of the bureau on page 18 of its annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, as follows:

"For the purpose of restricting the number of passengers that may be carried on motor vessels other than steam, I recommend that section 4464, Revised Statutes, be amended so as to read:

"The inspectors shall state in every certificate of inspection granted to vessels carrying passengers, other than ferryboats, the number of passengers of each class that any such vessel has accommodations for and can carry with prudence and safety."

"I would suggest that the word 'steamer' in the first line of section 4465, Revised Statutes, be stricken out and the word 'vessel' inserted in lieu thereof in order to meet the amendment to section 4464."

"The same matter is again referred to in the annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, on page 15 of which appears the following comment:

"Sections 4463, 4464, and 4465, Revised Statutes, referred to in my previous report, should be amended without delay, and in the interest of the safety of the traveling public I beg to renew my former recommendations upon this subject, and earnestly request that you urge upon Congress the necessity of this legislation."

"Again, in the annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1907, page 27, this recommendation was renewed in the following language:

"Under the present law there is no authority to restrict the number of passengers that may be carried on motor vessels other than steam, and for the purpose of correcting this condition I would recommend that section 4464, Revised Statutes, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4464. The inspectors shall state in every certificate of inspection granted to vessels carrying passengers, other than ferryboats, the number of passengers of each class that any such vessel has accommodations for and can carry with prudence and safety."

"For the purpose of harmonizing with this proposed amendment, I would recommend that section 4465, Revised Statutes, be amended by eliminating the word 'steamer' in the first line and substituting therefor the word 'vessel.'"

Lastly, your attention is invited to the statement appearing under the heading "Transportation of persons," on page 25 of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, which reads as follows:

"In the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, reference was made to the attention which had been given to precautions against the overloading of passenger steamers, showing, first of all, how this matter was taken care of by the certificates of inspection that are issued by inspectors, in which certificates the statement is made as to the number of persons that shall be carried on passenger steamers. The effort made in detecting the overloading of passengers after the issuance of the proper certificate was also pointed out. The inspectors of this service are giving their attention to the passenger-carrying allotment of these passenger and excursion steamers, and the number of passengers permitted to be carried to-day is relatively smaller than that permitted to be carried a few years ago. In any event, the original jurisdiction is placed by law in the hands of the local inspectors, and those are the officers who are responsible, and this bureau has impressed upon those officers that they will be held strictly accountable in this respect.

"During the past fiscal year there was put into use a new form for reporting the number of passengers carried. As these cards were received in the bureau they were carefully examined, and in every instance where it appeared that there was any overloading, or a suspicion of it, the matter received prompt and immediate attention. It is not the steamers subject to inspection that violate the law, or on which danger exists in the matter of carrying passengers; where danger exists is on motor vessels not subject to inspection, and on motor vessels in some instances subject to inspection.

"In this connection your attention is invited to the statement in the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1907, where, on page 27, it was stated that under the present law there is no authority to restrict the number of passengers that may be carried on motor vessels other than steam. For the purpose of correcting this condition it is recommended that section 4464, Revised Statutes, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4464. The inspectors shall state in every certificate of inspection granted to vessels carrying passengers, other than ferryboats, the number of passengers of each class that any such vessel has accommodations for and can carry with prudence and safety."

"It will be noted that the recommendation substitutes the word 'vessel' for 'steamer.'"

"Under present conditions, so far as relates to motor vessels, the situation is partly met by the equipment of these vessels; that is to say, the vessels are boated according to the number of persons they carry, but it must be obvious to anyone that this is an attempt to control a dangerous situation by indirect methods that are never satisfactory. Will it be necessary that there shall be some great catastrophe in order to eliminate the danger of carrying too many persons on motor boats? A change should be made in the law before this occurs. It seems to be the history of human nature that no great progress has been made except by the shedding of human blood. In the light of the past why is it necessary that this historical condition should be required to repeat itself?

"Therefore, your attention is urgently called to the matter so that the proper legislation may be at once brought before Congress, with a view to correcting this very dangerous condition."

The conclusion of the whole matter is that the original responsibility rests upon the local inspectors in the matter of passenger allowance. This is a condition that has given the bureau much concern and worry lest the local inspectors may not always exercise good judgment in the matter of passenger allowances. The bureau has tried to devise some way by which the statutes could be amended, taking the authority out of the hands of the local inspectors entirely, but at the present time it is not seen how this authority can be taken from them and obtain satisfactory results. It might prove necessary to have every ship carrying passengers measured and tested by experts, with a view to ascertaining what the passenger allowance of these vessels should be, but under the provisions of law as they exist at present it is impossible to do this. The bureau has endeavored to impress upon the local inspectors the seriousness of this responsibility which rests upon them, and condemns in unqualified language any local inspector who exercises the great authority conferred upon him by section 4464, Revised Statutes, without fully appreciating its seriousness.

FIREPROOF CONSTRUCTION OF EXCURSION STEAMERS

While all eyes are turned in the direction of requiring stability tests of vessels, do not let us forget other perils that are as terrible as the unseaworthy ship. Reference is made to the danger of fire, and attention is called to certain recommendations that have heretofore been made in connection with that peril. In the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, under the heading "Experiments in fireproof river and excursion steamers," on page 21, the following statement appears:

"The question of the inflammability of the ordinary type of river and excursion steamer is one that should have the fullest consideration by the department, and while fire is one of the worst conditions that we have to meet, and the most appalling in its results, little or no effort has heretofore been made to design or construct these steamers upon any different plans than those in use for years. Paints, compositions, and various other compounds of a so-called fireproof character have been suggested and tried, but none seems to have met the purpose of its design. There is now in course of construction in one of the prominent shipyards of the country a river steamer nearly 300 feet in length that has been designed with a view of having her as nearly fireproof as utility will permit. Upon the success of this experiment will depend whether or not fireproof construction in this class of vessels may be demanded, and if so the Government should lose no time in enacting legislation that will make such construction imperative in this type of vessel.

"Every disaster carries with it a lesson, and not one of them should go unheeded. Each accident should be made the subject of a most thorough and searching investigation to determine the cause and remedy the defect. The annual inspection of a vessel is no guaranty that her equipment is maintained in serviceable condition throughout the term of her certificate of inspection, and for this reason I believe that intermediate inspections are not only important but that they are absolutely necessary and essential for safety. Accidents can never be totally eliminated from the risks of navigation, but a strict observance of wholesome laws and consistent rules will so reduce their number that confidence will be more firmly established, strengthening the public opinion that every precaution is being exercised to promote safety, so far as it is possible for rigorously enforced, well devised laws and rules to provide it."

Attention is invited also to the paragraph appearing under the heading "Fireproof construction of excursion steamers," commencing on page 15 of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, which reads as follows:

"In my last report I referred briefly to the experiment of a fireproof excursion steamer, and it gives me pleasure to report that this matter has now passed its experimental stage. The construction and operation of a fireproof excursion steamer has proven successful beyond the strongest hopes of those who conceived this type of construction, and I renew my recommendation that Congress enact such legislation as will imperatively demand that fireproof construction be required in all excursion steamers hereafter built or contracted for."

Attention is also invited to the last four paragraphs appearing on page 17, under the heading "Hull inspection," of the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, which reads as follows:

"The Steamboat Inspection Service inspects vessels in order to make travel by water safer, and while this service has done much to have lifeboat and fire-fighting apparatus provided, it nevertheless remains a fact that the most important thing to do is to make the ship itself as nearly unsinkable as possible. Having done this, it then becomes necessary to place on board the vessel the proper equipment to take care of those who travel on the ship, and to see that the vessel is properly manned. It is believed that the greatest peril which has to be met on board ship is fire, and in order to follow out the principle of making the ship itself as safe as possible before taking up the question of

equipment, the Government should require that all excursion steamers be entirely fireproof.

"It may be claimed by some that it would not be practicable to make excursion steamers absolutely fireproof and yet be commercially successful, but attention is invited to a statement made in the annual report of the Supervising Inspector General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905. In that report it was stated that the question of the inflammability of the ordinary type of river and excursion steamer is one that should have the fullest consideration of the department, and that while fire is one of the worst conditions that we have to meet, and the most appalling in its results, little or no effort has heretofore been made to design these steamers upon any different plan than those in use for years. It was pointed out that paints, compositions, and various other compounds of a so-called fireproof character have been suggested and tried, but none seems to have met the purpose of its design. It pointed out also that at that time there was in course of construction in one of the prominent shipyards of the country a river steamer nearly 300 feet in length that had been designed with a view to having her as nearly fireproof as utility would permit. In the same report for the succeeding fiscal year it was stated that the construction and operation of a fireproof excursion steamer had proven successful beyond the strongest hopes of those who conceived this type of construction. The Supervising Inspector General therefore renews his recommendation, made in the annual reports of 1905 and 1906, that Congress enact such legislation that will demand this fireproof construction to be required on all excursion steamers hereafter built or contracted for.

"In the meantime, admitting that we do not have absolute fireproof construction on all excursion steamers now in use, the best precautions that we can take against loss of life and property is to maintain the very best fire-fighting equipment on these steamers, manned with crews well drilled and competent to fight fire should it break out.

"Until Congress requires fireproof construction of excursion steamers, it is believed that the use of the sprinkler system, already adopted by many passenger steamers, should be extended."

While we have been fortunate in not having any great fires recently on excursion steamers, it is a peril which none the less exists, and though we may have any number of regulations in regard to fire-fighting equipment, in order to prevent such another disaster as occurred on the steamer *General Slocum* the best way is to remove the cause for such a disaster and require absolute fireproof construction of excursion steamers. This can not be done until Congress acts, and the bureau most earnestly invites attention to the necessity for legislation in this respect.

I believe it is well worth while to have referred to this report as it covers the ground so fully and it surely, in view of what has occurred, will make a profound impression upon us all and spur Congress to action in providing the necessary legislation. In just a moment, I am going to refer to the last report of the Supervising Inspector General and call your attention to something which to my mind is startling to say the least.

In stating, emphasizing, and repeating what Congress has failed to do, it is only fair to say that Congress has done something in the way of compelling the building of first-class ships by the passage of the Jones-White Act at the last session.

Under the Jones-White Act, ships receiving mail contracts or receiving the benefits of the loans therein provided, are auxiliary vessels of the Navy, and as such, must be approved by the Navy Department. The plans of these ships are submitted to the Department of Navy and that gives the Government supervision and control in their construction. It is only fair to say that the Bureau of Construction of the Navy Department is attending to this work very seriously and in approving these plans, though the ships are auxiliary naval vessels, have not lost sight of the fact that they will in all probability spend their useful life in the merchant marine and must be made and constructed for commercial purposes. This becomes very important, gentlemen, because the safer a ship is made, the more precautions that are taken in building these water-tight compartments, in placing bulkheads running way up to the top deck without doors and entrances while they naturally increase the safety of the ship, it all has the tendency of reducing the serviceability of the ship as a merchantman. It is through the desire to make ships safe under unusual circumstances that has developed in this country an unusually high type of safe ships.

I want to pause right here to say that the highest-class ships we have in the way of safety happen to be engaged in the South American trade at this very moment in competition with the old British tubs of the Lampert & Holt Line, to which, as you know, belonged the *Vestris*. These ships with an unusual high degree of safety are the *American Legion*, the *Southern Cross*, *Western World*, and the *Pan American*. Another fine line of American ships are the *President Harding* and *President Roosevelt*, en-

gaged in the North Atlantic trade and operated by the United States Line. Then we have the so-called Merchant Line, with ships of unusual high degree of safety, as the *American Trader*, the *American Banker*, the *American Farmer*, the *American Merchant*, and the *American Shipper*. In the Pacific we also have the so-called President boats. The *President Grant*, *President Madison*, *President Jackson*, *President McKinley*, *President Cleveland*, *President Lincoln*, *President Pierce*, *President Taft*, and the *President Wilson*. Quite a formidable fleet of splendid, safe passenger steamers, all under the American flag. It is interesting to note that most of these steamers were built with the principal object in mind to make them safe. Many of them were built originally and most of them were designed as transport ships in time of war, when the submarine danger was very great. All the ingenuity that man could devise was put into these ships to make them safe. I refer to these ships and their present service in the mercantile trade as a complete answer to the argument that if too much safety is put into a ship her construction is such as to impair her commercial serviceability and reduce her earning powers. These ships prove that that is not so. I have already mentioned two latest ships of the American merchant marine, the steamer *California* and the steamer *Virginia*, which represent the finest type of ships for passenger service where nothing for the safety of the passengers was omitted.

But, gentlemen, it will not be very long before the provisions of the Jones-White Act will not be able to absorb any more ships. So that the present temporary and incidental control of hull construction now being carried on by the Navy Department is by no means permanent and does not in the slightest avoid the necessity of amending our shipping laws. Besides, there are many ships being built which require the supervision I have suggested before and which is so urgently being demanded by the Steamboat Inspection Service.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will be pleased to yield when I finish my statement.

I have spoken about the inspection and supervision over ships, and that was in reference to our own ships. As to foreign ships, we are governed mostly by treaty provisions. Countries having similar standards of inspection as ours have their ships exempt from our supervision and inspection. That exemption applies where such country's ships are plying between our ports and the ports of her own country. For instance, English ships plying between American ports and Great Britain do not come under our inspection. Passenger ships are required, however, to have certain life-saving equipment which our regulations require as a minimum. Foreign ships plying between American ports and ports not of their own country do come under our jurisdiction for supervision and inspection. The law on this point is likewise confused and inadequate. It is my firm belief that the law should be amended and provide definitely and specifically the extent of the supervisory jurisdiction and inspection of United States over such ships so engaged. Coming back to the *Vestris*, that was a British ship plying between New York and South American ports, and came within that provision of the law which required inspection by United States officials. It is my belief that if the *Vestris* were an American ship she would have long ago lost her certificate of seaworthiness. Why, gentlemen, up to this late date there is not a complete set of plans of the *Vestris* in this country. She was never submitted to what is known as inclining test or stability test. Every American ship is required to submit to such an inclining test. Section 16 of rule 7 of the General Rules and Regulations of the Steamboat Inspection Service provides for such stability tests. The rules also provide for a complete set of plans of the ship to be filed in order to determine mathematically the structural stability of the vessel. Again I want to point out that even this rule is local and under the jurisdiction of the supervising inspector and not of the central office.

I am advised by competent naval architects and reliable shipping men that if the plans of the *Vestris* had been examined and the vessel submitted to a stability test, it would have demonstrated that the vessel was utterly unseaworthy. The question arises now how far can we go on a foreign vessel in taking her out and submitting her to such tests. I hold that a foreign vessel engaged in the passenger trade between the United States and foreign ports not of her own country must submit to all the requirements, inspections, and tests that this Government may demand, and that it can not properly raise a legal, technical, or other objection and resist such inspection and tests. The sister ship of the *Vestris*, the steamer *Vauban*, is operated by the Lampert & Holt Line and engaged in the same service as the ill-fated *Vestris*. Sister ships, as you know, are built of the same design, from the same plans and specifications. I believe it is not only prudent but necessary to submit the

steamer *Vauban* immediately to an inclining test. That will not only establish her condition but also test our powers under the law. If the owners resist an order for such inspection, the case should be taken to court immediately and the matter decided. As I said before, legislation should be enacted to leave no doubt as to our rights over such foreign vessels.

I have this day therefore addressed a request to the Supervising Inspector General asking for such an inspection. I will read the letter:

DECEMBER 14, 1928.

HON. DICKERSON N. HOOVER,

Supervising Inspector General,

Steamboat Inspection Service Department,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER HOOVER: Under the law you have jurisdiction over foreign vessels plying between American ports and countries not their own. Just how far this jurisdiction goes and whether you have as complete jurisdiction over such foreign vessels and American vessels I believe there is a difference of opinion. It seems to me that foreign vessels engaged in the carrying of passengers from American ports to other countries are in no position to raise any technical objection to any inspection or test which may be required by your service. It has been impossible to date, I am informed, to obtain a complete set of the plans of the ill-fated steamer *Vestris*. That being so, it is indeed difficult to determine the stability of this ship. It is apparent from what took place that her stability was very low. I understand that the same company is operating a sister ship to the *Vestris* called the steamer *Vauban*, this ship being of the same construction and design of the *Vestris*. After what took place and the lack of complete set of plans, I would ask you to submit the steamer *Vauban* at her next call at an American port to a stability test such as is required of American vessels under section 16 of rule 7 of your regulation.

Such a test will be useful not only in providing necessary data in arriving at correct conclusions concerning the *Vestris*, but will also make it known to the owners of foreign vessels engaged exclusively in trade between the United States and other countries that that same degree of safety and high standard of construction and strict supervision required of our own vessels will be required of foreign vessels so engaged.

Very truly yours,

F. LAGUARDIA.

Mr. SIROVICH. What is a stability test?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is putting a vessel in an inclining position to establish by actual test her ability to right herself into normal position. It tests the structural strength of the vessel when placed in an abnormal position such as when a ship is listed to one side. Take this ship, if she is inclined, say, 5° [indicating] she would immediately come back to an even keel. Now, the great danger when a ship is rolling is that in a very high sea, a great many things might happen. If she is structurally weak and continues to roll, strain is placed on part of the ship that might be weak and something is bound to break. A ship having proper stability can easily take 15° to 20° lists [indicating] and must be constructed to absorb a list of 30° [indicating]. In the case of the *Vestris*, where perhaps cargoes shifted or water seeped in when she got into a list, she was unable to recover but continued over, taking in more water all the time until she sank. The listing of the ship in connection with her stability, of course, becomes of the utmost importance in time of distress. Gentlemen will recall the case of the *Lusitania*. The ship was torpedoed, but the direct damage of the torpedo was not necessarily fatal. The ship immediately took water and commenced listing. [Indicating on ship model.] Unfortunately all her air ports were open and water rushed in through the entire length of the ship so that her water-tight compartments were of no avail, water being taken through one whole side of the ship. The *Lusitania*, by the way, had longitudinal bulkheads and that raises another question that I will not go into to-day. The great ship *Titanic*, which was on her maiden trip west, it will be recalled, sank after hitting an iceberg. Steaming at full speed in an iceberg field she hit an enormous mountain of ice and tore her hull a great length, so that several of her compartments were immediately flooded. That great ship sank in less than two hours. I do not want to get away from the main subject, and that is the necessity of the revision of the law affecting merchant ships. I pointed out a few moments ago the recommendations made heretofore by the Steamboat Inspection Service.

The report of the present supervising inspector general of the service for 1928 was published on July 2 of this year. I want to say right here that Mr. Hoover, the present supervising inspector general, has come up from the ranks. I believe he spent most of his life in the Steamboat Inspection Service. He knows his job and he, too, ever since he took office has been urging Congress through his annual reports for legislation to bring

the service up to the requirements of the day. His 1928 report is most interesting and contains specific recommendations for legislation and suggests several amendments to the law. It continues the unheeded recommendations contained in the report of 1915. Gentlemen, I am going to read Captain Hoover's report. For some reason that I can not understand his report was deleted, blue penciled, and emasculated by some one in the Department of Commerce so that Congress has not the benefit of his views and recommendations if it reads only the report as it appears in the printed form issued by the Department of Commerce. In all likelihood the Secretary of Commerce did not see the inspector general's complete report. I am sure you will all agree that Congress is entitled to have the complete report unrevised, unabridged, and in full of every bureau head or chief of a department required by law to submit an annual report. Before I proceed reading Mr. Hoover's report I want to show the House the printed report which I hold in my hand and you will see that it contains one short paragraph on page 1 and all of page 2. From page 3 on are the tables and figures submitted in the original report. Here is the report as submitted by the head of the Steamboat Inspection Service and the recommendations made by him therein. I will read it as it is very interesting and instructive:

REPORT OF THE SUPERVISING INSPECTOR GENERAL STEAMBOAT INSPECTION SERVICE

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION SERVICE,
Washington, July 1, 1928.

THE CENTRAL OFFICE

Nothing could show more forcibly the awakening of interest in the American merchant marine than the volume of work passing through the office of the Supervising Inspector General. It might be interesting to know of the numerous requests that are received from people all over the country and in all walks of life for information concerning things maritime. These requests come from persons who are desirous of locating missing relatives, who may be licensed officers, members of the crew, or persons supposed to have been passengers on vessels. They come from students and instructors in high schools and colleges for information concerning the activities of this service. This is a healthy condition of public interest, for it shows that our people upon the seaboard as well as from the interior points in the Mississippi Valley are turning their eyes again to the sea.

The head of this service is a member of the executive committee of the American Marine Standards Committee, and has participated actively in the work of standardization which has been sponsored by you. The American Society for Testing Materials has been doing excellent work in connection with standardization of the testing of steel plates, and in this work this service has cooperated actively. Two years ago the head of this service had occasion to address the National Council of Safety at its annual meeting in Detroit, Mich., and again in October an appropriate address will be made before the same organization in New York City.

Reference is made to these activities that touch this service because they have their effect upon the volume of work constantly passing and are but incidents in the regular routine of work in connection with the direction of a large service like this, which covers the entire United States, Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, and Porto Rico; and, because of this increased pressure of work, because of the awakening of the people concerning things maritime, and because of the necessity of improving methods, it has become quite apparent during the last three years, and markedly so in the last year, that there must be a larger force in the central office. You will recall that in the last annual report I pointed out the manner in which the work of the central office might be reorganized and was fortunate in obtaining the services of three additional traveling inspectors, who will take oath and assume duty on July 1, 1928. Those inspectors will be used largely in connection with the stability work, much of which is behind, and all of which is increasing in volume from day to day, in connection with the regular work of the service.

In the estimates for 1930 I must stress the necessity of the appointment of two additional traveling inspectors, with headquarters in this office, to be used in connection with the standardization of examination questions for licensed officers and in checking the work of inspectors in the crewing of vessels, equipment required, and the approval of boilers, all with a view to obtaining uniformity throughout the service. We have in this office valuable data relating to the operations of this service, but, valuable as this data may be, it also may represent many errors of procedure, because of inadequacy of force to check up the work of the districts; and, having in mind that the Supervising Inspector General is required, under the law, to obtain uniformity of procedure, and realizing that uniformity can only be obtained by constant supervision and review in order to carry out the requirements of the statute, it is necessary to have an expansion of force in the central office.

When it is considered that, at the present time, aside from the official direction of the Supervising Inspector General, there are six

traveling inspectors attached to the central office, and this without any adequate increase in the number of clerks in that same office, it is obvious that this bureau must have additional clerical assistance, because the correspondence, reports, and investigations that are constantly being conducted by this trained technical personnel require the assistance of properly trained clerks to carry on this work.

Right here is a table of personnel which is included in the deleted printed report, and I will therefore omit it. The original report continues:

In what is truly a mechanical age, when we may be prone to stress things other than men, it is none the less apparent that what is needed, more and more, is men, and efficient men. This bureau has endeavored to carry out constantly the desire of the administration for economy, and its record will show that it has successfully done so. There comes a time, however, when it is absolutely necessary to have a larger number of inspectors so as to maintain the high standard of inspection that is insisted upon by this office. Accordingly, in the estimates for 1930 I will recommend the appointment of 12 additional assistant inspectors, 2 to be stationed at each of the following ports: New Orleans, Baltimore, Boston, San Francisco, Portland, Me., and Galveston. There are, in fact, other ports where additional assistant inspectors might be used, but those named above are the ones where the need is most pressing at the present time. By the act of May 22, 1928, there was created a board of local inspectors at Hoquiam, Wash., and in the estimates for 1930 I will cover items that will make it possible, if Congress makes the appropriation, for that board to commence active operations on July 1, 1929.

Another matter vitally affecting personnel is that of salaries, and the salaries paid by this service are too low. The Welch bill gave some relief, but it did not correct conditions. To the extent that that bill gave small promotions to employees who had for years not received proper compensation we are truly grateful, but this matter of salaries in the Steamboat Inspection Service can not be finally adjusted until it is adjusted according to principle and not according to amount alone.

It is not a question of how much money shall be paid to an employee, so much as that the proper amount shall be paid, taking into consideration the duties performed and the skill possessed, and when the salaries of the employees of this service are measured by that rule, it will be found that they are greatly underpaid, which must always result in dissatisfaction. For example, supervising inspectors have a range of salary from \$3,800 to \$4,400 when their range should be from \$5,200 to \$6,000, and assistant inspectors, who receive the lowest compensation of the inspectorships, have a range from \$2,900 to \$3,400, and should have a range from \$3,200 to \$3,700. The clerks in the field, too, are greatly underpaid and, having in mind that they are required to do expert court reporting in addition to difficult clerical work involving the application of the provisions of the general rules and regulations as well as the statutes, larger salaries should be allowed. No court or committee of Congress would be willing to pay such low salaries for the skill required in like work for them. Such a condition should not exist, and if the classification of the field employees is to be studied by the Personnel Classification Board, or any other governmental agency, I trust that it will be studied in a constructive sense—not with the thought of paring down salaries or of giving a certain amount of money as a stop-gap, but with the purpose of correcting salary injustices along constructive principles.

I have to stress again the desirability of placing the supervising inspectors of this service under the classified civil service. These officers are at present in the presidential class, but every one of them, including myself, are employees who have been promoted through successive grades to their present positions. This is a service that exists, primarily, for the purpose of making transportation by water safe, and that task can be best carried out by men who are not amenable to the vicissitudes of politics. For the first time in the history of the Board of Supervising Inspectors, every member of that board is an employee who has reached it by promotion, and in order to continue the good work that has been for so many years carried on, and the policy that has been respected by all administrations, regardless of party, I submit below a bill to amend section 4404, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 373), as amended by the act approved July 2, 1918:

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 4404 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4404. The positions of supervising inspector in the Steamboat Inspection Service are hereby placed under and included in the classified civil service. There shall be 11 supervising inspectors, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, in accordance with and under the provisions of the act of January 16, 1883, known as the civil service act. The supervising inspectors shall be entitled, in addition to his authorized pay and traveling allowances, to his actual and reasonable expenses for transportation of instruments, which shall be certified and sworn to under such instructions as shall be given by the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 2. That this act shall be effective on and after the date of its approval."

During the year I have kept in close touch with the work of the districts, and, while I have not been able to visit every district, I have visited every part of the United States, including the Pacific coast, and I anticipate being able to report for the next fiscal year, having visited again every local district. I hope that I may have the opportunity of going also to San Juan, Porto Rico; Honolulu, Hawaii; and the Alaskan districts. This service has nothing about it of a monastic nature. It is not away from the world but in it, and it must give service constantly. It can only do so by the maintenance of an efficient personnel, and the head of the service can only know how things are being done and what his employees are like by going into the districts and observing the effect of the operation of laws and rules and regulations and the efficiency of the personnel.

STABILITY CONDITIONS

I have referred to the fact that the stability work is behind. This is because we have been attempting to do with two men work that requires four. I hope that during the coming year we may be able to bring this stability work up to date. All that we have been able to do in connection with the stability tests has been to work out the one condition of stability that presented itself in connection with the particular ship that was being inclined. What we should be able to do, and will do with the increased force, will be to work out the five or six different conditions that properly should be considered in each inclining test. With the limited force that we have, should we be called upon to bring into court detailed information in regard to stability tests, while we could comply there would be considerable delay in working up the calculations. With the cases completed, requested information may be furnished at a moment's notice.

There seems to have been an impression abroad that it was the purpose of this office to standardize stability calculations. That impression is erroneous, and it undoubtedly grew out of a very praiseworthy effort in connection with the activities of the American marine standards committee. It is to be borne in mind that every vessel must be handled upon its merits, and, while there are certain general fundamental rules that are to be followed by all experts conducting inclining tests, yet the greatest rule of all must always be kept in mind, and that is that a rule that may apply to one ship would not necessarily be applicable on all fours to others. I believe that the United States Government was the first, and was alone for a number of years, in requiring stability tests. If my information is correct, the British Government now has similar requirements or is contemplating them. There may be some objection to the Government undertaking to require stability tests, but I would say to that objection that, while it may not be possible to lay down standardized rules, there is no expert but who must admit that the problem exists of being sure that a vessel possesses proper stability.

It may be true that much discretion must be left to the master, but our stability calculations have already shown that there are a number of vessels in which we have required fixed ballast that have undoubtedly been made safer by the requirement, and it can be shown that in the adjustment of disputes—and there have been some in regard to stability requirements—this office, while always keeping in mind safety, has proceeded in every instance as generously as possible, and has always applied the principle of settling each case upon its merits.

BOILER INSPECTION

For some time the proper technical committee of the American Marine Standards Committee has been working upon a tentative boiler code for this service. However, it is not to be forgotten that the legal responsibility rests with the Steamboat Inspection Service. If boilers are constructed according to rules that are dangerous, that responsibility is in this service, and it can not be avoided or side-stepped. Having in mind, however, the necessity of proceeding constructively and in accordance with best modern practice, I did, as you know, request the advice of the American Marine Standards Committee in connection with boiler construction, my thought being that we would take the best in all of the codes, including our own as it at present exists, and build from all of them one that may be considered the best and in advance of all others. In so proceeding, we must have no pride of opinion, and the controlling factor must be that which is the best in principle for the purpose to be met. I intend within the next fiscal year to move actively in this respect, and by that time I trust that I may have the suggestions of the committee above referred to.

In regard to boiler inspection, however, it must be remembered that many of the criticisms directed at this service, while they are justified, can not be charged against the work of the Board of Supervising Inspectors. It is to be remembered that in this respect, as in many others, the Board of Supervising Inspectors is controlled by statutory requirements of Congress. I submit below a suggested form of bill to amend sections 4433 and 4418, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 411 and 392), which, if enacted into law, will give the Board of Supervising Inspectors the authority that it needs:

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 4433 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4433. The working steam pressure allowable on all boilers in vessels which are required to be inspected under the laws of the United

States shall be determined under and in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall hereafter establish in respect thereto."

SEC. 2. That section 4418 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4418. The local inspectors, under such rules and regulations as the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall hereafter establish in respect thereto, shall also inspect the boilers subject to steam pressure and all the attachments, connections, equipment, apparatus, and appurtenances thereof, on all vessels required to be inspected before the same shall be used and at least once in every year thereafter. No local inspector shall approve any such boilers or the attachments, connections, equipment, apparatus, or appurtenances thereof unless in his opinion they meet the requirements of said rules and regulations and may be safely used in the service proposed. The local inspectors shall also subject all such boilers to hydrostatic tests in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall hereafter establish in respect thereto."

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect three months after its passage.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

The British Government has extended an invitation to the leading maritime powers to attend an international conference on safety of life at sea in London in the spring of 1929. As that conference has to do with safety of life at sea, manifestly this service is one that is vitally interested, and it is actively participating in the work of the Government incident to the preparation for that conference. The agenda submitted by the British Government covers suggestions with reference to subdivision of ships, life-saving appliances, wireless telegraphy, fire-extinguishing appliances, ice patrol, and collisions at sea. In connection with those suggestions this service is actively engaged in the work of the committees on life-saving appliances and fire-extinguishing appliances, the Supervising Inspector General acting as chairman of the committee on life-saving appliances, and the supervising inspector of the ninth district acting as chairman of the committee on fire-extinguishing appliances.

For the last three years this office has been actively engaged, with the assistance of that supervising inspector who is chairman of the fire-fighting committee of the Board of Supervising Inspectors, upon a study of fire-fighting apparatus, in connection with which particular attention has also been given to fire-indicating apparatus. In pursuing these studies the service has not proceeded in an *ex parte* manner, but it has invited to its conferences representatives of shipbuilders, underwriters, and owners of steamships, having in mind that, while safety must be had at all times, a business must not be regulated in such a manner as to destroy it. So far as the British suggestions for fire-extinguishing appliances are concerned, it is pleasing to note that this service has for a number of years been proceeding along modern lines, but there is progress yet to be made. Our thought has been to have apparatus that is powerful in the extinguishment of fire. That is good, but it is better when planning for construction to have a ship as nearly fireproof as possible when being built. This thought is consistent with that given in my last annual report concerning the desirability of excursion steamers being built of fireproof material.

While it has been contended that it is not practicable to build fireproof excursion steamers, or steamers other than of the excursion type, yet there are features of a safety nature that can be considered and that will doubtless be considered by the international conference. For example, in the building of vessels, our rules and regulations cover no provisions with reference to fire-resisting bulkheads, excepting in so far as reference is made to steel casings about boilers, metal-lined lamp lockers, oil rooms, etc. In speaking of bulkheads, I have reference to fire-resisting bulkheads, notably in the 'tween decks, and these bulkheads should be carried as high as may be necessary, and where such bulkheads might interfere with interior design, fire curtains could be substituted. While it is realized that the stairways of passenger ships are quite often selected by marine architects as one of the most beautiful features in a ship, they might well have in mind that something should be done toward protecting these stairways against draft in case of fire, as continuous stairways form a regular flue for draft.

In connection with the work of the committees on fire-extinguishing appliances and life-saving appliances, the service has prepared comparative statements showing the requirements under the convention of 1914, the present British proposals, and the present American practice, and it is believed that it will be found as the result of the compilation of this data that better and more constructive work will be accomplished in the study of the requirements so as to ably prepare the American delegates to the conference than in any other way.

Gentlemen, I would not have burdened you with this report nor would I encumber the RECORD with it had it been reported in full in the published printed report of the Department of Commerce. Having been deleted of most of its meat and substance, its recommendations having been blue-penciled, I deem it

proper to bring it to your attention and to have it appear in the permanent RECORD. I do hope that recommendations therein contained will be carefully considered by Congress.

Speaking of inspection, gentlemen, a great deal of criticism was directed a few weeks ago to the inspection of the *Vestris*, and in all fairness I want to say that under existing regulations, considering the conditions existing in our busy ports such as New York, San Francisco, and Seattle, it is absolutely impossible for an inspector to do his work according to regulations and hold his job. If he were to attempt to inspect in accordance with the requirements of his own regulations, gentlemen, the steamship companies would come to Washington, would get members of their delegation to go to the department, and that inspector would have to lay off or lose his job. There is no doubt about it. Let me give you an illustration. He is required under the regulations, not under the law but under the regulations, to take the lifeboats and lower them to the water on the one side and on the other side to the dock. Now, gentlemen, anyone familiar with dock conditions knows that it is physically impossible, if that ship is loading in a busy port, to lower those boats on the dock side, and 9 chances out of 10 on the off side she has coal barges and is coaling or has freight barges or the ship at the next dock has such barges, and it can not be done. Question: Is this inspection and test of lifeboats necessary? If so, we must write it into the law, and we must make provisions giving the inspector the right to order the boat freed from the docks and then have a real lifeboat inspection. One of two things must be done, gentlemen: Have the law specify and authorize the details of the inspection, or else not to expect the impossible from the inspector. There is no other way to aid the inspector. We must either do this or simply have regulations for window-dressing purposes, expect the inspector to make a perfunctory inspection, sign a certificate, and if everything goes all right, all right; or if anything happens, then blame him. We must decide definitely just what inspection is necessary, write that into the law, and back the inspector who is carrying out the law in the performance of his duty.

Now, gentlemen, as to foreign ships, I stated a minute ago that ships plying between American ports and home ports are not required to submit to any examination, assuming that the standards of their country equal ours. Ordinarily this ought to be sufficient. I am going to tell you of an instance where one of the largest ships afloat left the port of New York in the month of December, 1924, with a full complement of passengers in an absolutely unseaworthy condition. If it had so happened that that ship had encountered a storm, every marine engineer concedes that she might have broken apart. I am referring to the British steamer *Majestic*. The statement I have just made is very serious. I would not make it if I were not absolutely sure that it is correct. The case of the *Majestic* and her condition on that December trip in 1924 has been the discussion of naval architects all over the world. Strange as it may seem, nothing appeared in the press of either country giving the details or stating the extent of her damage and the great danger in sending her out on the eastbound trip with what is known in the parlance of the sea "her back broken." I am going to read to you gentlemen an article appearing in *Marine Engineering*, of August, 1925. It is written by one of the foremost naval architects in this country. Although the article is technical in its character, it is so well written that a layman can readily understand and realize the serious condition of the ship on that trip. The article is written by Commander Edward Ellsberg, formerly of the United States Navy, and a man in whom every Member of this House has confidence. [Applause.] I read the article:

It is an unfortunate truth that no shipowners will publish the facts concerning structural failures of their vessels. As a consequence, the naval architect is usually enabled to learn little or nothing from the defects found in operation on ships other than those belonging to his own company. A few rumors get about, conjectures are made—usually erroneous—but the actual facts ordinarily remain a secret and the designer can only guess at the faults.

A shining example of this nature was the accident to the *Majestic* last winter. This vessel was so damaged as to necessitate her withdrawal from service from late December until nearly May for repair. Her condition was extensively commented on in the British press at the time and her canceled passages were briefly noted in the American papers. What caused the damage, the extent of the trouble, and the adequacy of the means taken to remedy it were not made public. It was noted that even in the British shipbuilding press there was considerable criticism of this policy.

A knowledge of the facts in this case will lead to the conclusion that the damage, instead of being the result of general structural weakness

or of any unusual strains peculiar to large ships, was due only to a local strain arising from a detail error in design which was in no way connected with the size of the ship.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE "MAJESTIC"

Chronologically, the following was the sequence of events:

During the summer of 1924 it was discovered that the C deck of the *Majestic* was fractured at the midship section in way of the inboard lobby. The C deck is the strength deck of the vessel, forming the top flange of the ship girder. This deck at the sides is formed of two courses of plating, which doubling is carried inboard on each side for several strakes, but these doubled stringers are pierced both port and starboard by the uptakes which on this vessel come through near the sides instead of on the center line as in the ordinary ship.

Just inboard of these uptake openings the deck is still further cut away by an elevator shaft on each side. This construction results in leaving only about 25 per cent of the beam of the ship intact inboard of the elevators and uptakes. However, this inboard section of the deck was not intended to take any strain and was made only five-eighths inch thick as compared with the deck stringer plating which is about 2 inches thick at the side and about 1½ inches thick in the strakes next inboard.

It was the section of 5/8-inch plating between the elevators which was first discovered to have parted. The failure in this location was verified by taking down the ceiling underneath. At the time, little importance was attached officially to the fracture. As the light plating here was not the strength plating, the vessel was not considered weakened and, as it was then in the midst of the tourist rush, nothing was done to remedy the damage. It was apparently intended to defer repairs to some slack period in the future. However, a little reflection, and a further investigation at this time as to how a light strake could ever get sufficient strain to let go when there were outboard of it heavy strakes intended to take all the strain, would have proved both illuminating and profitable.

There can be no doubt that such an investigation would have shown the deck stringers on both sides already fractured through a considerable portion of their width, so that the strains in working had been partly thrown on the light strakes inboard, with the consequences noted. But the C deck at the sides was a weather deck covered with wood planking; underneath, the stateroom ceilings sheathed it. If anyone connected with the ship had any doubts, they were not strong enough to cause the laying open to inspection of the deck stringers, and no examination of them was made.

Matters continued in this status until the westbound trip in December. Very rough weather was the rule on this trip. While still over a day out from New York, a loud report, likened by many to "a cannon shot," was heard. An investigation showed that the C deck had now cracked open all the way from the starboard to the port side, and that the port sheer strake had also let go, the crack in it extending down the side to the top of a circular porthole, where the crack stopped. The starboard sheer strake held.

The *Majestic* made her way to New York, and sailed as per schedule on her return voyage to Southampton. The crack in the C deck on the port side opened as the vessel worked, about one-half inch, but the damage did not extend further. On this eastbound trip the weather was apparently not bad. On arrival at Southampton, all future trips were canceled, and the ship laid up for an indefinite period for repairs by Harland & Wolff.

STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS OF THE DECK REVEALED

The wood decking was removed from the C deck and the staterooms underneath torn out. Structural conditions of the deck were revealed as follows:

At the forward outboard corner of each uptake hatch the plating of the deck was cut out on a right angle. There was no compensation fitted around the corners of the opening. Just outboard of the uptake corner, and about 8 inches from it, another rectangular hole about 12 by 20 inches was cut through the deck stringer for a ventilator trunk. Just outboard of this ventilator was a butt in the adjoining strake of the deck plating, with its consequent close-rivet spacing. About 18 inches forward of the uptake was an expansion joint in the superstructure, which commenced just above the C deck. Underneath the C deck, and in line with the edge of the uptake, was a girder which ended with a small bracketed connection to the uptake plating. Inboard of the uptake openings were the elevator shafts as already pointed out.

All the above factors produced a most obvious line of weakness, which happened to come right on the midship section. In addition, failure to compensate the heavy deck for the openings cut in it, especially at the forward outboard corners, resulted in concentrating at these sharp corners all the strain carried from forward by a much wider strake of heavy plating.

Due to this local strain, it is evident that the cracking first started at the square corners. From this point, the cracks ran outboard a short distance into the ventilator hole. From here the cracks continued outboard, along the line of closely spaced rivets in the butt strap, to the

2-inch deck stringer, through which they ran to the sheer strakes and down the port sheer stake at its weakest section into a porthole.

FRACTURE GRADUALLY EXTENDED ALONG WEAKEST SECTION

It will be seen that in this case the damage followed the weakest section. Considering the structure and nature of the fracture, it is clear that the fracture was progressive. From the port and starboard uptake corners (diagram) worked their way outboard, rivet by rivet, until enough of the deck was gone on both sides to make the light inboard plating take part of the strain. This light plating then let go, which damage was soon discovered, as in this location there is a central passage over this spot and the interior deck covering would crack with the deck. This was the condition in the summer of 1924.

The progressive rupture of the C deck continued through the fall, and when in December the vessel was finally exposed to heavy weather, there was so little of the top flange left that, under a real strain, the remaining metal let go with a bang. It is safe to assume that at this instant the vessel was rolled to the starboard side, so that the port sheer stake was also acting as part of the top flange, and, consequently, was partly torn through when the deck parted.

There have been numerous instances previously in ships, buildings, and machines where cracks have started in structures that were adequately strong generally, but where a local stress was excessive due to an error in detail design. A crack once started is bound to extend itself, especially in a structure subjected to alternating stresses, regardless of the strength of the section through which it is working. Recognizing this, the designer usually tries to prevent the start by making all points subject to excessive local strain considerably stronger than the remainder of the structure and by making all changes in shape take place gradually. To these ends the machine designer fillets his corners and thickens up his shoulders; the ship designer endeavors to avoid sharp corners, and compensates all openings by thickening up his plating. Both Lloyds and the American Bureau rules require compensating plates around openings cut in strength members.

Just why the German designer of the *Majestic* failed to compensate his strength deck when he cut out an oblong section of it on each side with the uptakes is not known. It can only be assumed that the stresses were so low in the sections of the deck stringers left that the chance of local concentrations of stress at the corners was overlooked.

HOW REPAIRS WERE MADE

In repairing the damage, care was taken to insure its nonrecurrence. All fractured plates were, of course, replaced. The initial error was corrected by making the new plating around the uptake corners half an inch thicker than the adjacent deck plating. In addition, the ventilator opening near the corner was eliminated, the butt strap outboard of the corner was moved several frames away, and the girder underneath the deck was more securely fastened to the uptake bulkhead. The effect of all this was to eliminate the line of relative weakness and to reinforce the corner against local strain. Finally, in renewing the fractured deck plate inboard between the elevator shafts, the thickness was increased from five-eighths inch by laying a new doubling, several hundred feet long, over this section. This, however, appears a useless precaution. As there are no inboard longitudinal bulkheads to connect this plating to, it can never take a strain until the outboard sections of the deck, which, due to their connections to the shell, act as the flanges, give way. As means to prevent such a mishap to the outboard plating have been provided, the strengthening of the deck inboard was unnecessary, resulting only in needless expense and addition of weight.

As this structural failure on the *Majestic* was not one peculiar to large ships, it is hoped that a knowledge of the trouble in this instance will prove useful to naval architects in the future in designing anything from yachts to liners.

The importance of the main deck, which I attempted to explain a few moments ago, will readily be seen from the reading of Commander Ellsberg's article.

It will require but little argument to show the necessity of writing into the law provisions which would compel foreign vessels engaged in passenger traffic and not subjected to our inspection to report to the proper authorities of our Government accidents or any damage sustained by the ship in order to give American officials an opportunity to pass on her seaworthiness before American citizens are permitted to embark as passengers at the risk of their lives.

Now, I want to call attention to another phase of the law which is very interesting. The owners of the *Vestris* are not liable in one single cent of damages to the families of persons who lost their lives through their negligence. When the *Titanic* and the *Lusitania* sank the owners were not liable for one cent of damage to the families of the people who lost their lives. That is under the act of 1851, where the liability of owners are limited. This law of limited liability was first enacted in France in the sixteenth century, when imprisonment was the punishment for nonpayment of a debt or judgment. When small sailing ships, usually owned by one individual and often the master of the ship, there might have been some reason for the

limited liability. It was adopted in England during the reign of George III, and was followed by the colonists. It was put into the Revised Statutes in 1851.

Not only that, but the owners of the vessel can pocket the money that the insurance companies pay and still raise the defense of limited liability as provided for in the statutes. That was held as far back as 1886. The Supreme Court of the United States held that the statute of limited liability gave owners full protection and that the money received from insurance companies for the loss of the vessel could not be made applicable for the payment of damages.

I will read section 4283 of the Revised Statutes, which perhaps is the most archaic provision of all our laws.

SEC. 4283. The liability of the owner of any vessel for any embezzlement, loss, or destruction by any person of any property, goods, or merchandise shipped or put on board of such vessel, or for any loss, damage, or injury by collision, or for any act, matter, or thing, lost, damage, or forfeiture done, occasioned, or incurred, without the privity or knowledge of such owner or owners, shall in no case exceed the amount or value of the interest of such owner in such vessel, and her freight then pending.

Gentlemen, that is the law to-day and exactly as it was in the sixteenth century when first enacted. The dangers of the sea at that time can not be compared with conditions of to-day. I do not mean that the sea is less violent or that the elements have changed at all. But when this law was first enacted there were only tiny sailing ships. Compare that with conditions today—steel construction, water-tight compartments, and, above all things, the radio, which has made the isolation of a ship a thing entirely of the past. So that the risks of the sixteenth century are not to be compared with the risks assumed by owners of ships in the twentieth century. Negligence of the owners, of course, should not be exempt by the statute. Oh, yes, I will concede that the statute specifically says "without the privity of the owners"; yet, gentlemen, that is absolutely no safeguard, as it is humanly impossible under the law and the decisions and the way the steamship business is conducted to ever prove the privity required by the statute.

I noted several of the Members shaking their heads when I referred to the limited liability law being applicable in the United States courts to foreign owners of foreign ships as against claims for losses suffered by American citizens. It was so held in the case of *Oceanic Steam Navigation Co. v. Mellor* (the *Titanic*) (233 U. S. 718). The case of the *Lusitania* will be found in 351 Federal, 715. I might say right here that England has modified the law and, while it has not entirely repealed the limited liability statute, it does impose a minimum liability on the owners, where the ship is a total loss, of £15 a ton for loss of life and £8 a ton for loss of freight. That is a total—let me see—of about \$115 a ton.

A splendid and scholarly review of the history of the owners' liability law will be found in the case of *The City of Norwich* reported in 118 United States, 468. That was really the test case, and as I said before it was decided in 1886. Several like cases were considered by the court at the same time and the question of whether or not insurance was applicable to the payment of damages or could be pocketed by the owners came up in the case of the *Great Western*, reported in the same volume on page 521, and it is in this latter case that a strong dissenting opinion was rendered. The dissenting opinion was rendered by Mr. Justice Matthews, with whom concurred Justices Miller, Harlan, and Gray. In this case, like in so many other cases where a property right was placed above a human right, the court decided by a divided vote of 5 to 4. I just want to read the closing statement in the dissenting opinion referring to the insurance feature of the case. Mr. Justice Matthews closed the dissenting opinion in these words:

We can not bring ourselves to think that Congress intended by limiting the personal liability of the shipowner, in cases where previously his whole fortune was responsible for the wrongs committed through his agents and representatives, to the value of his interest in the ship, which was the instrument of the injury, to permit the innocent party suffering the damage to go entirely without redress, when the vessel in fault, by disaster subsequently happening during the whole period of the same voyage, has been totally lost, and the owner, by a contract in force when the wrong was done, receives full compensation by way of insurance for the loss he has incurred, and has thus restored to him the offending vessel, not indeed in specie but in value. It seems to us it is the meaning of the statute that the owner shall receive no pecuniary benefit from his interest in the vessel doing the wrong which shall not inure to the compensation of him who has suffered the loss which it has caused. And that meaning Congress has taken pains to express by the use of the word "interest" as the subject which, or the value of which, the owner must surrender and transfer or account for, as the price of his immunity from personal liability, because it is appro-

prate to convey the idea, being large enough to embrace, not the mere legal title to the vessel or the wreck and remnant of her which may be saved from the perils of the voyage but every claim and benefit which constitutes to the owner its substance and value, capable of measurement in money.

I am sure that we have outlived the necessity of limited liability and I am certain that a study of existing law and prevailing conditions will result in the repeal of the statute. I can think of nothing that will make ships safer than repealing the limited liability provision of the law. It certainly is cheaper under existing law for owners to lose the entire ship, pocket the insurance money, and escape the payment of all damages. Once the liability is removed we will have little trouble in making shipowners comply with all the safety provisions of the law.

I have introduced a bill to repeal the limited liability section of the law. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Personally, I believe that it belongs to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I intend to confer with the chairmen of these two committees so that proper reference may be made. I do hope to get some action on it.

I do not say that we can sit here and on the spur of the moment revise these laws. I do not believe that a congressional investigation would do any good, because other fact-finding agencies of the Government have already attended to that. But I do believe that we should give this matter serious study and consideration and do it speedily. I suggest in my resolution (H. J. Res. 329) a commission to take all of the available data, to take the experience of the past, to study the laws and the treaties existing, and to make specific recommendation to Congress for the revision of our shipping laws.

I provide in my resolution for a commission to consist of three Members of the House; two Senators; an officer from the Bureau of Construction of the Navy; the senior naval officer; a delegate to the Conference at London for the Revision of the Convention of 1914 for the Safety of Life at Sea—and I will tell why in a moment; the Supervising Inspector General of the Steamboat Inspection Service of the Department of Commerce; a naval architect from the Naval Architects' School of the University of Michigan, and one from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; a representative from the American Shipping Bureau, and one from the Society of Naval Architects. That would be a well-balanced commission. They could take their time and would necessarily have to wait the result of the London conference and take the findings of the conference into consideration. That is why I include the senior naval delegate from the United States sitting in the conference as a member of the congressional commission. That would establish the necessary contact between the London conference and this commission.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it necessary that such a resolution be passed. I do not care whether it be mine or some one's else, because I have no pride of authorship, but I think it should be passed at this session of Congress.

To show how sometimes we act hastily, although in the particular instance to which I shall refer we acted on good advice, we appropriated \$12,000,000 for the reconditioning of the *Mount Vernon* and the *Monticello*. Those two boats were built 26 years ago. They are of the old German school that departed from the accepted formula of beam and draft. They are very narrow. The Germans have gone back now to the old formula. Those ships have low stability. They are 26 years old. Each will be required to carry at least 1,300 tons of fixed ballast, besides their water ballast. Yet we appropriated \$12,000,000 to recondition them.

There is conflicting thought as to the advisability of reconditioning those two ships, and it is hoped that the appropriation will not be expended on those two old hulls, because the traveling public will be loath to take passage on them.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Who has the discretion in respect to that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think it is in the Shipping Board. I do not think that I am violating any confidence when I suggest that any Member who is interested should consult some of the experts in the Bureau of Construction of the Navy, and consult some of the practical men who advise against this. It will take about a year and a half to recondition them, while it would take only two years, perhaps, to build new ships. In these days of keen competition, in the face of the splendid ships we are building of the type of the *Malola*, the *California*, and the *Virginia*, and those other ships I mentioned, it is simply ridiculous to spend that money on those two ships, and put them in the North Atlantic trade and expect to compete with the ships of foreign countries that we find in that trade, seeking American passengers.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it not a fact that the \$12,000,000 authorized and appropriated for the reconditioning of those two ships would build two new ships of the same capacity?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Perhaps not entirely, but very nearly.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is \$6,000,000 a ship, and I would say to my friend that \$6,000,000 even to-day will build a mighty fine ship.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It would certainly be criminal waste to spend it on those two ships.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. The decision to which the gentleman referred awhile ago, I believe, was in 1886. Does the gentleman recall whether the owners of that ship were at fault?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That makes no difference.

Mr. GREEN. I want to ask the gentleman about the *Malola*.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let me make that clear. As I said before, if you can establish privity between the owners and the accident, which is almost impossible, then, of course, the limitation does not apply, but in doing that you have to practically establish criminal negligence.

Mr. GREEN. That was just what I wanted. Is this *Malola*, which the gentleman mentioned here, of the type commonly known as the nonsinkable?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As near nonsinkable as a passenger ship can be. You understand, of course, you can make a warship more resistible to sinking than a passenger ship, because you must provide space in a passenger ship for cargo and passenger accommodations, such as large dining rooms, smoking rooms, and the like, while on a warship you can put several longitudinal bulkheads besides the cross bulkheads. Of course, it would not be possible to do that in a merchant ship required to also carry freight. But she is as nonsinkable as a passenger ship could be.

Gentlemen, I sincerely hope that Congress will no longer delay giving this subject consideration and action. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15089, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CHINBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15089, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon the item on page 70 referring to fees for examining surgeons, Bureau of Pensions, was passed over until to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to return?

Mr. CRAMTON. I desire to return to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan desires to return to page 70 under the arrangement made at the last sitting of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. At that time there was pending an amendment to the paragraph which I had offered following the action on the point of order. Since our adjournment I have discussed this matter with the Commissioner of Pensions, and I have here a memorandum from him and I will be glad to have it read, if it is desired, suggesting the importance of the paragraph. I have discussed it with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], who has, as I understand, given it other study and made investigation. The gentleman from Wisconsin suggests a change in the language further to perfect the situation. That change in language is indorsed by the Commissioner of Pensions and is entirely satisfactory to our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman indicate what the change is?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is to perfect the situation as to the examinations already ordered. If permission is given me, I will withdraw the amendment, although perhaps I had better offer this as a substitute for the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state there is an amendment pending offered by the gentleman from Michigan on page 70, line 5, striking out the paragraph and inserting certain language. Does the gentleman from Michigan ask permission to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I am offering this as a substitute for the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to offer a substitute for the amendment which he offered at the sitting of the committee on yesterday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] to the amendment proposed on yesterday:

Page 70, line 5, strike out the paragraph and insert the following:

"For fees and mileage of examining surgeons engaged in the examination of pensioners and of claimants for pension, for services rendered within the fiscal years 1920 and 1930, \$300,000: *Provided*, That hereafter all necessary medical examinations of claimants or pensioners not heretofore paid shall be made by one physician or surgeon, duly appointed under the act of July 25, 1882, as amended (U. S. C., p. 1194), secs. 71, 72), and duly designated for such examination by the Commissioner of Pensions, except when in the judgment of the said commissioner the examination should be made by more than one: *Provided further*, That the fee paid any such physician making such examination alone, or otherwise, shall be \$5 for each examination, foreign or domestic."

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order against the amendment. It clearly violates the rule laid down by the Chair yesterday, in that it does not come within the provisions of the Holman rule. The Chair ruled on that yesterday, that where it gave the commissioner discretion to appoint more than one, he might appoint more than one in every case. It not only fails to come within the scope of the Holman rule on that but it clearly indicates that he can pay them \$5 apiece hereafter, which will increase the expense instead of lowering it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if I could explain the details of the matter to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], he would not be disposed to insist on the point of order. It would be very easy, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, to so draft the amendment as to avoid the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. That is what I think. But now the gentleman comes and puts back into the bill the very thing against which the Chair ruled yesterday.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have endeavored to meet the views of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] and have offered the amendment in this shape. It is a complete rounded-out provision.

Mr. BLANTON. It is in effect exactly the same as the gentleman proposed yesterday.

Mr. CRAMTON. Not absolutely. The amendment which I offered yesterday, to which no point of order was raised, and which is now pending—

Mr. BLANTON. Because the Chair ruled it in order as coming within the Holman rule.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, the amendment which I offered yesterday and which is still pending was of a legislative character. It was exactly the provision reported by the committee, except that there was omitted the provision permitting the Commissioner of Pensions in his discretion, where desirable, to order an examination before the full board instead of before one member. That is the only difference between the amendment offered yesterday and now pending and the original recommendation of the committee. I am sure the gentleman from Texas would not be opposed to that being included, because the Commissioner of Pensions assured our committee that there will not be a great many cases where he would order pensioners before the full board. But there are some in which it is desirable by the commissioner to have an examination before a full board.

Mr. BLANTON. But in that case the applicant for pension can get it only when the commissioner sees fit to give it to him. I have in mind some of our hard-boiled physicians in the Veterans' Bureau who have made ridiculous decisions in regard to disabled soldiers. In the Pension Bureau you have no appeal. When you have a hard-boiled physician he turns a man down and the man has no appeal at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. The only thing in this controversy now seems to be that one clause—

Mr. BLANTON. Which takes it out of the scope of the Holman rule—

Mr. CRAMTON. And which I can get around if the Chair forces me to. But let us consider the matter on its merits and vote it up or down according to the merits. If not, of course, all that I have to do is to redraft that amendment—

Mr. BLANTON. To conform to the Chair's ruling.

Mr. CRAMTON. To get around the Chair's ruling—

Mr. BLANTON. And the Chair will not let him do that.

Mr. CRAMTON. He will so long as I am parliamentary about it.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Michigan comes back and offers the self-same amendment that the Chair has ruled out of order—

Mr. CRAMTON. With a provision in it that the gentleman from Wisconsin desired.

Mr. BLANTON. Fortunately for the country the Congress is composed of 435 Members, some of whom are from States other than Wisconsin, and all of whom ought to be heard in behalf of the people.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that the amendment is one of very great importance to the good administration of the pension laws.

Mr. BLANTON. I am thinking about disabled soldiers obtaining a pension.

Mr. CRAMTON. And I am thinking about them, and also the Commissioner of Pensions is, and the commissioner emphasizes the need of this legislation. Of course, if my amendment carries as to this provision concerning these examinations before a full board—if it were to carry a provision to the effect that in no more than 10 or 20 per cent of the cases there should be such examinations before the full board, we would be keeping within the Holman rule, and we would be defeating the very thing the gentleman from Texas has in mind.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman stated yesterday that out in California, where one board made 30 examinations in a day, these physicians getting \$90 under the law would be getting entirely too much money. He is fixing it so that one physician in California can make 30 examinations a day and get for it \$150.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, since this matter came before us yesterday I have made an investigation and have consulted the Commissioner of Pensions. It is not the intention to abolish the boards and give one member all of the examinations. The boards will be retained so that if their services should be required for a board examination they can be had. Under the proposed plan one physician will not make all the examinations which his board would make under the plan now in effect. The examinations will be assigned to various members of the present boards.

Mr. BLANTON. But this present commissioner may die or resign to-day and another commissioner may come in.

Mr. SCHAFER. I will say to the gentleman that from the standpoint of the pension boards in my district, which is a city district, perhaps the change is not necessary; but I have found upon investigation that in the rural communities there is a great hardship not only in having the board members travel many miles from their places of residence, but in having many of the veterans travel hundreds of miles to these boards; I have concluded after further investigation and consideration that it would be well to give the new plan a trial, and then if it does not work we can change it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have not reversed my position. I make the point of order that it is in violation of the Chair's ruling.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that let me suggest this: There is pending now before the committee the amendment which I offered yesterday, which very clearly carries legislation in its last sentence, where it provides that the fee hereafter to be paid shall be \$5 instead of \$3. That is clearly legislation. It is true it could be sustained in an appropriation bill under the Holman rule, but the Holman rule does not take away its legislative character. It is still legislation. I am offering an amendment to-day that is also legislative, as the gentleman from Texas suggests, but it is germane to the amendment offered last night.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the very position I took yesterday, and the Chair cited a decision rendered by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Hicks, which he showed does not sustain the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the gentleman from Texas is not following me, apparently.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I followed the gentleman. I took that position yesterday, and the Chair said—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further, because I want to complete my statement without taking too much time of the committee. The gentleman has not understood what I said at all. I am suggesting that because the amendment already pending is legislative in character the amendment which I now offer, which is germane, is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard for just a moment. The Chair held this provision in order only because he said it came within the Holman rule and that on its face it showed it might bring about a curtailment in expenses, but the Chair would not rule to that effect until they cut out the provision which the gentleman from Michigan is now offering in this last amendment. Now, the Chair can not say that the last amendment will come within the Holman rule, because, as the Chair said the other day, the commissioner may appoint every single one of these three men on boards and may not save one single penny. The Chair can look only at the face of the bill, and the Chair has cited the decision made by Mr. Hicks, which answers the very contention made by the gentleman from Michigan, and I presume the rule which applies in committee one day will apply all the time as long as the same Chairman is in control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish my colleague would not insist upon his point of order for this reason: If we are going to change this law, which it seems we are going to do, I think it preferable to give the commissioner discretion to have more than one doctor make examinations when deemed necessary, rather than the iron-clad rule that only one doctor should do so. I think the commissioner should have authority to exercise this right not only in behalf of the Government but in behalf of the applicants for pensions, so that if we should have a constituent who was examined and we were dissatisfied with the examination made by one doctor I feel sure the Commissioner of Pensions would, upon request, have him reexamined by the board of doctors. For that reason, I would prefer giving the commissioner discretion to appoint more than one physician to make an examination when he thought it necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. I would rather keep the law we have here than to be compelled to get down on our knees and beg the commissioner to do something which we can make him do by law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not think we would have to beg the present Commissioner of Pensions because I think he has been both courteous and fair in his treatment, not only of Congressmen but of applicants as well.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] offered an amendment which was pending at the time the committee rose and which reads as follows:

For fees and mileage of examining surgeons engaged in the examination of pensioners and of claimants for pension, for services rendered within the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, \$300,000: *Provided*, That hereafter all necessary medical examinations of claimants or pensioners shall be made by one physician or surgeon duly appointed under the act of July 25, 1882, as amended (U. S. C., p. 1195, secs. 71, 72), and duly designated for such examination by the Commissioner of Pensions. The fee to be paid any such physician making such examination, alone or otherwise, to be \$5 for each examination, foreign or domestic.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] thereupon made a short statement with reference to this amendment and it might be considered that that statement was debate and the Chair would hold that it was debate. To-day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] asks unanimous consent to offer a substitute for the amendment which was pending and that consent was granted. The substitute reads as follows:

For fees and mileage of examining surgeons engaged in the examination of pensioners and of claimants for pension, for services rendered within the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, \$300,000: *Provided*, That hereafter all necessary medical examinations of claimants or pensioners, not heretofore ordered, shall be made by one physician or surgeon, duly appointed under the act of July 25, 1882, as amended (U. S. C., p. 1194, secs. 71, 72), and duly designated for such examination by the Commissioner of Pensions, except when in the judgment of the said commissioner the examination should be made by more than one: *Provided further*, That the fee paid any such physician making such examination alone, or otherwise, shall be \$5 for each examination, foreign or domestic.

This substitute is exactly like the amendment offered yesterday and pending to-day except that after the words "claimants or pensioners" in the second line of the proviso, this phrase is added, "not heretofore ordered," and also after the words "Commissioner of Pensions" in the phrase "duly designated for such examination by the Commissioner of Pensions," there is added this clause: "Except when in the judgment of the said commissioner the examination should be made by more than one."

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes the point of order that the substitute contains legislation and is therefore in violation of the rules of the House.

Whether the amendment offered yesterday by the gentleman from Michigan, for which a substitute was offered this afternoon, was itself out of order, it seems to the Chair is immaterial. The result, in the opinion of the Chair, will be the same. If the amendment offered yesterday was not subject to a point of order, the additions to that amendment in the substitute are clearly legislation and under the substitute repugnant to the rule. If the amendment offered yesterday came within the protection of the Holman rule, it contained legislation. The substitute offered to-day contains the same legislation and also additional legislation, in the opinion of the Chair. Both of the phrases added in the substitute are in the nature of additional legislation, but the Chair particularly calls attention to the second new matter in the substitute reading as follows:

Except when in the judgment of the said commissioner the examination should be made by more than one.

The Chair thinks that the rule laid down by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in Hinds' Precedents, No. 4, page 563, states the condition of the rules and precedents of the House upon this subject.

Mr. BURTON, then Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, said:

The Chair will state that the general rule, apparently established, is as stated in the Digest:

"A paragraph which changes existing law being allowed by general consent to remain, it may be perfected by any germane amendment."

"Now, it appears that a proviso was included here and passed without objection which would have been subject, the Chair believes, to a point of order. To that an amendment was proposed. There have been, as the Chair is informed, conflicting decisions, and it is desirable that a uniform rule be established. The rule has been applied that where a provision is inserted which changes existing law it may be perfected by an amendment (which is germane), even though not in accordance with existing law."

"The Chair, though somewhat doubtful, thinks this the best rule: That if a paragraph has been included in the bill which has in it a taint of illegality or of being contrary to existing law, that paragraph can be corrected or perfected by an amendment; but if the further paragraph which is proposed as an amendment carries a further degree of illegality affecting the whole paragraph as amended, then it is not in order."

"So, if the amendment of the gentleman from California simply pertained to the proviso which was out of order—that pertaining to the Bertillon system of identification, which was allowed to enter the bill—it would be in order, but if it pertains to the whole paragraph relating to the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act it is not in order."

The Chair, with some reluctance—

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the Chair permit an observation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is to be observed that both the changes that are proposed in the amendment now submitted and now before the Chair are changes that come more closely in harmony with existing law; that is to say, it exempts from the change all examinations heretofore ordered and that certainly leaves the existing law in effect as to examinations heretofore ordered. Secondly, the existing law provides for an examination before more than one, and the second provision refers to the examination before more than one in the discretion of the commissioner. Both changes are not getting further away from existing law, but are bringing the amendment more closely in harmony with existing law.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair permit an observation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair let the gentleman from Michigan bring in this legislation only upon the ground that it came within the Holman rule, and the Chair shut out that part which did not come within the Holman rule, and did so very properly; and the other day when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] made his point of order on the word "hereafter," which was the only addition I had offered, and I made the very point that the gentleman from Michigan has now made, that where there is some legislation already, you can offer additional legislation, the Chair cited us to the decision by Mr. Hicks, of New York, which holds, just the same as Mr. BURTON's decision, that if it goes further, it is still subject to the point of order, and takes it without the Holman rule. If the Chair were to let the gentleman from Michigan do now what he sought to do the other day, it would be a reversal of the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment, offered by the gentleman from Michigan yesterday, changed the existing law and provided that hereafter all necessary medical examinations of

claimants or pensioners shall be made by one physician or surgeon duly appointed under the act of July 25, 1882, as amended, and duly designated for such examination by the Commissioner of Pensions.

This changed the existing law, took away the board of surgeons, deprived them of their authority, but provided that hereafter all necessary medical examinations of claimants or pensioners shall be made by one physician or surgeon. Perhaps, the Chair should not state it took away the board of surgeons, because it does not do that directly. The board of surgeons might still be appointed, but they would not make any examination, because under the amendment offered yesterday all necessary medical examinations of claimants or pensioners shall be made by one physician or surgeon.

The substitute offered this afternoon provides, first, that hereafter all necessary medical examinations of claimants or pensioners, "not heretofore ordered"—making therefore two classes—shall be made by one physician or surgeon duly appointed under the act of July 25, 1882, as amended, and duly designated, and so forth, except that when in the judgment of the commissioner the examination should be made by more than one, it may be made by more than one.

It seems clear to the Chair that this substitute goes beyond the scope of the amendment of yesterday and adds new legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and to simplify matters—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state there is now pending the amendment offered by the gentleman yesterday. The substitute has been ruled out of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; I offer this as a substitute for the paragraph or as a substitute for the pending amendment; it does not matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment must be disposed of.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute as an amendment to the pending amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. In order to get a ruling from the Chair and merely for that purpose I make the point of order that a Member, even though he be in charge of a bill, can not himself offer an amendment and then offer a substitute for his own amendment. If he wants to offer a different proposition, he must withdraw his amendment. It is something unheard of since I have been here for a Member to offer a substitute to his own amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Michigan. The Chair does not recall any decision on that matter and does not recall the practice.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is frequently the case that a Member offers an amendment to his own amendment. He has the same right to do that that any other Member has.

Mr. BLANTON. By unanimous consent.

Mr. CRAMTON. It does not require unanimous consent. I am in the same position as to the pending amendment as any other Member of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the rule in the House is that a Member may withdraw an amendment which he offers.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not withdrawing this.

The CHAIRMAN. But in Committee of the Whole that practice is not permitted.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not withdrawing the amendment; the amendment is before the committee and eventually will have to be acted on by the committee. I am placing before the committee the consideration of an amendment to that amendment, and I have the same right as any other member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds no precedent on the subject, and the parliamentary clerk informs the Chair that he does not know of any. The Chair will therefore decide it as a question of first impression. Under general parliamentary principles the Chair overrules the point of order. The Chair thinks that in the absence of a prohibition against a Member offering a substitute or an amendment, he has the natural inherent right within decorous conduct.

The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph on page —, beginning on line 5, and insert the following:

"For fees and mileage of examining surgeons engaged in the examination of pensioners and of claimants for pension, for services rendered within the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, \$300,000: *Provided*, That here-

after all necessary medical examinations of claimants or pensioners not heretofore ordered shall be made by one physician or surgeon, duly appointed under the act of July 25, 1882, as amended (U. S. C., p. 1194, secs. 71, 72), and duly designated for such examination by the Commissioner of Pensions, except when in the judgment of the said commissioner the examination should be made by more than one: *Provided further*, That the fee paid any such physician making such examination alone, or otherwise, shall be \$5 for each examination, foreign or domestic: *Provided further*, That such examinations especially ordered by the commissioner before more than one shall not exceed 10 per cent of the total number of examinations."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order in good faith that this has in it more vice than the other amendment. This does not come within the Holman rule. If the Chair will notice, instead of being restricted to three surgeons, it is unlimited. If the commissioner wants to do so he could appoint 20 surgeons. He is not limited to any number; he could appoint 20 or 100. There is no limit whatever, and instead of paying them \$3 apiece as they are restricted now, by this amendment the fee is increased from \$3 to \$5. The commissioner could enlarge the board and be within the provisions of the bill. Say he was to appoint 25 surgeons in one case at \$5 each. The Chair can not determine upon its face that that would retrench expenses. I submit that it is an enlargement of the present law. It is a change of law on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law and does not come within the rule.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist, in so far as the amendment is different from the pending amendment, that taken as a whole it is in order under the Holman rule. The existing law provides for an examination by a board of three at \$3 each, or \$9. The bill proposes an examination by one at \$5, except that the commissioner may in his discretion order an examination by more than one, but the total of those examinations by the board must not exceed 10 per cent of the total. Therefore, the reduction from \$9 to \$5 will more than overbalance the 10 per cent. The gentleman from Texas urges that the number is not limited. These are examinations before a board. This goes back to the existing law, and under the existing law there are only three physicians on the board. These boards are continued, these surgeons are all members of the board, and so an examination ordered by more than one is ordered before that board. It is possible, of course, if there is any ambiguity in the language to correct it.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman might offer another substitute.

Mr. CRAMTON. Possibly I may be forced to do that, but the ambiguity is not present because the existing law creates the boards and limits them to three.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The existing law, to which reference is made in the substitute, being found in the United States Code, page 1194, sections 71 and 72, reads, in the beginning, as follows:

The Commissioner of Pensions is authorized to appoint surgeons who, under his control and direction, shall make such examination of pensioners and claimants for pension or increased pension as he shall require; and he shall organize boards of surgeons, to consist of three members each, at such points in each State as he shall deem necessary, and all examinations, so far as practicable, shall be made by the boards, and no examination shall be made by one surgeon excepting under such circumstances as make it impracticable for a claimant to present himself before a board.

In the proposed substitute it is provided that—

Hereafter all necessary medical examination of claimants or pensioners not heretofore ordered shall be made by one physician or surgeon, duly appointed under the act of July 25, 1882, as amended (U. S. C., p. 1194, secs. 71, 72), and duly designated for such examination by the Commissioner of Pensions, except when in the judgment of the said commissioner the examination should be made by more than one.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes the point of order that under the language just quoted the commissioner might order the examination to be made by more than the number now constituting the board of surgeons. The Chair thinks that would be a very strained and far-fetched construction of the language, although it does seem that the language might a little more clearly limit the number that could be selected. However, the Chair thinks that the language in connection with existing law is plain enough to warrant and probably require, and the Chair thinks it does require, the construction that not more than three, being the membership of the board of surgeons, could be called in by the commissioner to examine a single case. That situation furnishes the only possible difficulty in the substitute.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, to relieve the Chair of difficulty, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not under any personal difficulty. The gentleman from Texas apparently observing the trend of the opinion of the Chair, withdraws the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us is one that we have discussed at some length, and in which I have had some difficulty. Now that the gentleman from Texas and I seem to be pretty much in accord again, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to have that amendment before the House without that last proviso upon it and if the gentleman from Texas will be reconciled to have it that way—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, is going to have its way anyhow, and why not let them have it now. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment before the committee by omitting the last proviso. That is the one with reference to the limit of 10 per cent of the examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to modify the substitute offered by him and now before the committee by striking out the last proviso. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, since I am on my feet I offer a statement from the Commissioner of Pensions with reference to this legislation, which I ask to have read from the desk.

Mr. BLANTON. Why take the time up in that way? Why not extend the gentleman's remarks and print it?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting that statement at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, December 14, 1928.

Memorandum for Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON

Of the 66,714 certificates of medical examinations made in the last fiscal year, 54,518 were made by boards of surgeons and 12,196 by single examining surgeons.

In the adjudication of pension claims, just as satisfactory conclusion was reached as to degree of disability on the findings of one examining surgeon as on findings of boards of three examining surgeons. In fact, the complaints of veterans and veteran organizations against the work of boards far outnumbered complaints against the work of single surgeons.

As constituted, boards have a president, a secretary, and a treasurer and much of the work devolves on the secretary who, as a rule, is the dominant factor on the board and his work is usually concurred in by the president and treasurer. Each doctor receives \$3 for his services. This fee is not attractive to competent physicians who receive not less than \$5 for examinations made for insurance companies or other concerns, and medical associations, local, State, and National, frown down upon a fee of less than \$5 for medical examination work. On the present \$3 fee basis the bureau is satisfied that it is not getting as good service as it would on a \$5 fee basis, as the latter fee would attract to the Pension Office medical examination service a better class of physicians and result in more thorough and satisfactory work.

Other Government agencies having to settle medical questions, such as the Veterans' Bureau, Indian Office, Employees' Compensation Commission, Civil Service Retirement Division, do so, almost entirely, on the findings of single surgeons and the medical determinations on such examinations are satisfactory to both applicants and the Government.

Under the proposed single-surgeon plan on a \$5 fee basis there will result a saving of \$3.35, as under the present board system the average cost per examination is \$8.35. In other words, as the average annual number of board examinations is 50,000, the total savings should, conservatively estimated, be something over \$150,000 per year.

As the number of outstanding board orders at any given time is about 8,000, unless provision is made in the legislation for these examinations and at existing rates, the result would be confusion as to payment of fees and dissatisfaction among claimants with outstanding orders for medical examination, because otherwise every outstanding board order would have to be canceled and boards and claimants notified and new examination orders issued to conform to the new system of examinations. To take care of this situation the attached provision is suggested.

The present medical referee of the Pension Bureau and the Commissioner of Pensions have been closely observing the workings of the present board system of examinations, contacting with boards and veterans' organizations as to work of boards, and are satisfied that the proposed

single-surgeon plan is bound to result in more complete examinations and a service more satisfactory both to the Government and the veterans.

WINFIELD SCOTT, *Commissioner*.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to know if the gentleman from Michigan desires his statement read as well as extended?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; in response to the sentiment it is not necessary that it be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the substitute. I was one of those who opposed this change in existing law yesterday when it was before the House. I have made a further investigation and have consulted with the Commissioner of Pensions and found that this is a proposition which he has advocated since 1928. One of the reasons why I opposed this proposition yesterday was that after carefully reading the entire testimony before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations I could not find any clear and convincing language indicating that the Commissioner of Pensions had approved the change. While the district which I have the honor to represent is a city district and the examining boards are convenient for my constituents, I found upon investigation that under existing law in many communities, especially the rural districts, applicants for original pensions and increases have a great deal of inconvenience, as on many occasions they have to travel long distances to an examining board. I have reached the conclusion that we should give this new proposition a trial, especially since I now know it has the whole-hearted approval of the Commissioner of Pensions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan to his own amendment, the substitute being modified in accordance with his amendment.

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KNUTSON. I rise for the purpose of submitting a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 61.

The CHAIRMAN. To what point?

Mr. KNUTSON. Line 17.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. KNUTSON. To offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to return to line 17 on page 61 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the amendment be reported pending the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported for the information of the committee.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNUTSON: Page 61, line 17, after the word "Interior," change the period to a semicolon and insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$10,000 of the principal funds on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall be immediately available for the purpose of aiding indigent Chippewa Indians upon the conditions herein named."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous consent? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Minnesota has offered an amendment, which has been read, and, without objection, will not be reread. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will say the committee is quite in sympathy with the purpose and has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, there is pending before us, if I recollect correctly, the item at the bottom of page 79. I think it had just been read by the Clerk. Am I correct in that? Has the Kittitas item been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The reading stopped at the end of line 24 on page 79.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 79, line 24, after the figures "\$20,000," insert the following: "Continuation of construction, \$862,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of \$138,000 of the appropriation of \$1,500,000 contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1929 (45 Stat. 277) shall remain available during the fiscal year 1930 for such continuation of construction."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I wish the gentleman would make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Has this new \$862,000 item been approved by the Budget?

Mr. CRAMTON. It has been.

Mr. BLANTON. Was an additional estimate sent in?

Mr. CRAMTON. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Has it been authorized by law?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is authorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there a law authorizing the expenditure of this \$862,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. And besides, it is in continuation of a work already in progress.

Mr. Chairman, the Kittitas division of the Yakima project in the State of Washington is one of the most important projects now under construction. It has been under construction for perhaps a year or two. For the present year the work is under way. At the end of this fiscal year the main canal will be completed to the Yakima River; also the north branch will be completed to Jones Creek on the north side of the Yakima River. The south branch of the canal will also be completed.

The program which the Budget sent to Congress was for \$1,500,000 for this project. That included an estimated cost of \$500,000 for a siphon to go under the Yakima River, and then \$500,000 for the construction of laterals subordinate to the north branch of the canal so far as constructed to Jones Creek, and then another \$500,000 to extend that branch of the canal from Jones Creek to Johnson Creek.

The situation surrounding reclamation in the West is one that has depressed our committee very seriously, and it is due to the fact that as projects are being completed in several States and water is made available, so frequently no use is made of the land; the work of settlement and development of the land for which the water is made available proceeds so very slowly. Therefore our committee feel that we ought to study very carefully the situation of projects under construction. We ought to take every action possible to insure proper use of these lands after the construction is completed. Oftentimes it involves the highest degree of cooperation as between the Government and adjacent communities, railroads serving that region, and even the States involved.

When the Commissioner of Reclamation came before our committee he reported to us that conditions were not satisfactory with reference to this project leading up to its final settlement. By reason of the showing made by the department, the committee omitted any item for construction. Just before the bill was reported, really too late for us to give it consideration in the bill, a representative of that district, who did not come here for this purpose but was on his way, arrived and in company with the Representative from that district, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS], he placed the situation very fully before our committee. Conferences were held with these gentlemen and with the Reclamation Service.

As the result of those further conferences, our committee felt it was not desirable to suspend the construction work, but we still feel it is desirable to slow it down somewhat, in the belief that thereby, there will be brought about a more active interest on the part of all elements concerned and that in the long run the project will be better off by some slowing down this year. Therefore the amendment which I have offered, by direction of my subcommittee, provides for an appropriation of \$862,000, plus a reappropriation of \$138,000. That gives them \$1,000,000 in cash for next year, which is \$500,000 below the regular Budget estimate.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman ought to revise the remarks he made in first debating this bill under general debate and claiming to keep it within the Budget estimates, because in addition to \$283,000,000 he first brought in, he has added from the floor already \$114,000, \$78,000, \$90,000, and now this very

enormous sum of \$280,000 more, so that the gentleman is building up quite an enormous bill out of his committee, from the floor and otherwise.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman desires, I will state that the bill as reported to the House was, as I recall, \$2,100,000, and a little more, below the Budget, and the \$114,000 and \$90,000 items are estimated for.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet \$10,000,000 more than the bill last year, which in turn was larger than the bill of the preceding year, and increasing all the time.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is wrong. I will say to the gentleman that the bill this year is lower than the bill of two years ago. The bill of two years ago was for \$311,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is \$10,000,000 more than the bill of last year, is it not?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think so, and for very good reasons. The gentleman does not want the pensioners to go without their money, does he? Did the gentleman vote for the bill to increase the pensions of Civil War widows to \$40?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. If so, that added \$10,500,000 to the annual expense of the Bureau of Pensions.

Mr. BLANTON. And these additions here of \$114,000, \$78,000, \$90,000, and \$862,000 are coming pretty fast.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield further until I can answer the gentleman. This Congress can not pass authorizations for the spending of money and then object to appropriations to take care of those authorizations, and the increase in pensions for Civil War widows amounts to over \$10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill as reported to the House is \$2,100,000 below the Budget, and the bill as it finally becomes law will not be one penny above the Budget unless this House takes it away from our committee. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that we knew when we reported the bill that we had under consideration this Kittitas item and that there would be some of it restored. When I spoke on Tuesday I discussed this subject and stated then that the committee would very possibly have some amendment to offer for the consideration of the House when the item was reached. The increases we have offered do not take up the reduction that the committee recommended in the bill, so if the House sees fit to accept such amendments as we are suggesting the bill will go out of this House very far below the Budget estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to ask the gentleman from Texas whether he withdraws his reservation.

Mr. BLANTON. This is not subject to a point of order, and I withdraw it.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to say, in regard to the amendment, that we very much appreciate the further consideration the committee has given this item.

This does not make an additional draft on the Treasury. This amount is to be appropriated from the Federal reclamation fund. The project is in the course of construction; it has been duly authorized by Congress and there have already been large sums of money expended. However, water can not be put on very much of the land until further construction is accomplished. The money already expended can not be returned to the reclamation fund until construction proceeds and water goes onto the land.

The Director of Reclamation says:

Dealings with the Kittitas reclamation district have been satisfactory and the financial condition of the district is apparently favorable.

Again he said:

The principal immediate need of the project is the rapid continuation of construction to reach the main body of irrigable land in the lower end of the project.

And coming from the Budget, from the President, and from the Director of Reclamation was the suggestion that there should be \$1,500,000 appropriated, besides the \$138,000 of unexpended balance. However, the committee at this time has not seen proper to include that whole amount that was recommended by the Budget and by the Director of Reclamation. I hope the committee will decide after further consideration to

adopt the language suggested by the Budget, which is as follows:

Yakima project (Kittitas division), Washington: For continuation of construction and operation and maintenance, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$1,500,000 contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1929 (45 Stat. 227) shall remain available during the fiscal year 1930.

That is the quickest way of putting the project on a paying basis and securing repayment of funds already expended. Roughly speaking, two-thirds of the cost of the project has been expended, while only one-third of the land (and that the least-desirable land) can be put under water.

The Kittitas project of 72,000 acres lies in immediate contact with highly developed, settled lands that have been producing abundantly and profitably for 30 to 50 years. Many of the project's lands have been dry farmed or partially irrigated and farmed for many years. Railroads and highways traverse the tract. Ellensburg, the thrifty county seat, with a State normal school, banking facilities, and markets of every kind, is but a few miles distant. Thousands of reliable, responsible business and professional people and farmers are backing this project and are determined that it shall succeed. On further consideration, I believe the committee will approve the Budget's recommendation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I should observe that I was in error in my statement of the amount the bill as reported is below the Budget. Instead of that amount being \$2,100,000, it is \$1,957,000.

Mr. BLANTON. That is close enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Secondary projects: For cooperative and general investigations, \$75,000.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. On page 571 of the hearings this colloquy occurred between the gentleman and Doctor Mead with reference to secondary projects:

Mr. CRAMTON. For secondary projects, for cooperative and general investigations, you want continued the \$75,000?

Doctor MEAD. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. You say you expect to spend all the appropriation for the current year?

Doctor MEAD. Yes. The expenses of the Colorado River Commission compelled us to drop everything else.

Is the gentleman able to state to the committee what Doctor Mead had in mind by that statement?

Mr. CRAMTON. As I recall, it was this special engineering commission or board of engineers with reference to Boulder Canyon Dam, which was authorized at the last session and was required to report at this session, and in their work the Reclamation Service, of course, cooperated and gave all the facilities that were requested.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. That is the point I am getting at. Was there any money taken from the Reclamation Service and used for defraying the expenses of this commission?

Mr. CRAMTON. I can not answer that definitely.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. The answer of Doctor Mead would imply that there was.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; I agree with the gentleman that would appear to be the case, and, of course, it would not be entirely improper if that proved to be the fact, for the reason that reclamation is involved in the Colorado River project. The item is reimbursable and if any money was expended for that purpose, it would be reimbursed from the Boulder Dam project; but I am speculating somewhat because I have no definite information.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the statement of Doctor Mead is so disconnected with anything that precedes or follows it that I was wondering if by some oversight something had been left out of the hearing.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I think nothing of that kind happened. Our committee had before it the statement above in smaller type analyzing this \$75,000 item, and the examination by our committee was not very thorough on this item, but everything that there was is in the record, according to my recollection.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I have gone over the statement very carefully and I can find no reason for the statement of Doctor Mead in anything that precedes or follows it, and I am just wondering what he had in mind, and thought perhaps the gentleman could enlighten me.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have given the gentleman my impression of it. I may not be entirely accurate, but it is the best I can do. The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whenever, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation shall find that the expenses of travel, including the local transportation of employees to and from their homes to the places where they are engaged on construction or operation and maintenance work, can be reduced thereby, he may authorize the payment of not to exceed 3 cents per mile for a motor cycle or 7 cents per mile for an automobile used for necessary official business.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph to ask a question. I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan if he does not think that this provision authorizing 7 cents per mile as an allowance where a Government automobile is used is rather high. They can make 300 miles a day which would mean an allowance of \$21 which they would be given for driving a Government automobile.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is their own automobile.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it may be a Reclamation Service automobile, and probably furnished most of the time.

Mr. CRAMTON. No, it is not. It is a privately owned automobile.

Mr. BLANTON. It does not say that, and the Reclamation Service has a number of automobiles. It can furnish a Government automobile and then allow an employee 7 cents a mile for maintenance, which is \$21 a day, because they can easily make 300 miles a day.

Mr. CRAMTON. This never applies to a Government-owned machine. This only applies to a privately owned machine.

Mr. BLANTON. Even in the case of a privately owned machine, 7 cents a mile would mean \$21 a day, and that is a high allowance for maintenance.

Mr. CRAMTON. And they, of course, pay the oil and gasoline expense.

Mr. BLANTON. They can drive a Chevrolet or Ford car of their own and pay for it in a short time if they are getting \$21 a day from the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. This includes the cost of gasoline, oil, and tires, and also includes depreciation.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but \$21 a day would be a very high allowance for a Ford or Chevrolet.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would be an exceptional case in any event. There would not be much profit in driving your own automobile on this basis.

Mr. BLANTON. I think that is rather high and this simply sets a precedent.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is not a precedent. There are many of these cases. This is not a new item this year, and this is not the only place where this plan is followed. This is quite general in the Government service.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, this paragraph is very adroitly drawn to come within the Holman rule, because it provides that only when he can decrease expenses can he make this allowance. What is the present allowance?

Mr. CRAMTON. This is what has been allowed for some time.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that; but what is the present allowance?

Mr. CRAMTON. This is the allowance now, and what the language about decreased expenses means is that they can travel in this way instead of some other way that is authorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no way of taking it out on a point of order because, unfortunately, it does not change existing law. I want, however, to file my protest against this allowance. I think it is exorbitant.

I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For engraving and printing geologic and topographic maps, \$107,000.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of getting some information. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if there was any discussion before the committee with reference to cooperating with the States in securing maps of forest reserves within the State with reference to fire protection? The State of Michigan would be willing to appropriate \$50,000 provided there was an appropriation carried in the survey item that would allow the making of maps of forest and forest reserves.

Mr. CRAMTON. The questions are not necessarily so closely related as the gentleman has in mind. This item is in reference to topographical surveys.

Mr. HUDSON. I know that; but I was asking for general information.

Mr. CRAMTON. This item would not have anything to do with fire prevention. I expect that that would come under the Agricultural Department bill so far as the prevention of fire in national forests. I think I know what the gentleman has in mind. The Geological Survey makes topographical maps, and in that work the States cooperate, including the State of Michigan. A part of that work involves the use of air photography, and we have been working to get better cooperation between the War Department and the Interior Department in that matter. In that connection I think the director of the Geological Survey of Michigan has urged the other subjects, which so far as I know goes outside of the Geological Survey. The maps the gentleman speaks of, although it has been urged, I do not think will fit in with this work. I mean the fire prevention.

Mr. TEMPLE. The Geological Survey makes these topographical maps for every purpose. We have been trying as much as possible to get away from making special maps that serve only one purpose. A topographical map is a map for everything. I think the proper solution is to go on with the topographical maps for fire prevention and every other purpose.

Mr. CRAMTON. In so far as we have anything to do with it it is a topographical map. As far as it involves aerial photography our committee insists that the War Department shall cooperate and push the work more rapidly than heretofore. If the State of Michigan wants \$100,000 worth of topographical work in one year, if they will appropriate \$50,000 that will be met by \$50,000 from Federal funds. In the last three or four years our committee has recommended sufficient money in topographical survey work to match the State contributions.

Mr. HUDSON. I feel sure that the gentleman from Michigan is ready to recommend the passage of such legislation as will provide funds that can be matched by Federal funds.

Mr. CRAMTON. The policy of our committee is not to force the work under the Temple bill, which provides for the completing of topographical maps in 30 years, but to appropriate enough money to match the State contributions so far as they can reasonably be forecast. It is not possible for the Survey to have a high peak one year and cut it down the next.

Mr. BLANTON. There are \$270,000,000 in the Treasury bill that the two gentlemen from Michigan do not need, and you might use some of that for these topographical maps.

Mr. HUDSON. Yes; that might be for fire prevention.

Mr. BLANTON. Fire water.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, upon the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to furnish aerial photographs required for topographic mapping projects, in so far as the furnishing of such photographs will be economical to the Federal Government and does not conflict with military or naval operations or the other parts of the regular training program of the Army and Navy flying services, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse the War or Navy Department for the cost of making the photographs, and the Department of the Interior is authorized to furnish copies to any State, county, or municipal agency cooperating with the Federal Government in the mapping project for which the photographs were taken. In the event that the War or Navy Department is unable to furnish such photographs in time to meet the needs for which they are requested, the Geological Survey is authorized to contract with civilian aerial photographic concerns for the furnishing of such photographs.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, with reference to this item, which ties in in a very important way with what my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON] has been discussing, the use of aerial photography, and our effort to get cooperation necessary between the departments, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and therein to include one or two letters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks and include therein some letters. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. In our hearings, as well as in the hearings on the War Department bill, appears considerable concern concerning the effort our committee has been making to secure effective cooperation of the War Department in the making of aerial photographs in connection with the work of topographic surveying. Full cooperation in that way will greatly promote this important topographic work and save money, but such cooperation has not been secured in a way to be very helpful. Delays have frequently amounted to denial.

An illustration was last year in Yosemite National Park, where the photographs were to serve the purposes of the special Yosemite commission as well as the topographic survey. The following memorandum illustrates the delays and the haphazard

compliance that has greatly weakened the value of the cooperation rendered by the Air Service of the Army in this work:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington.

Memorandum for Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON

As per your verbal request, there are attached hereto copies of such letters as we have in our files relative to a photographic survey of the Tuolumne Meadows in Yosemite National Park, which we hoped to have made by the Air Corps of the War Department and the Geological Survey.

You will note that we initiated proceedings through the Geological Survey by conference on August 31, following up this by an official request on September 1, that the Director of the Geological Survey made a prompt request upon the Air Corps on September 4, and that we were advised that orders had been transmitted by the Air Corps to Crissey Field at San Francisco on September 17. Inquiry at the survey, however, reveals that these orders were not received until October 20. I also find, nevertheless, that a flyer from Crissey Field made a preliminary flight over Tuolumne Meadows on or about September 25 without waiting for specific orders in order to test out flying conditions and cameras. In this flight he took pictures of the Tuolumne Meadows area and also of Yosemite Valley, copies of which were delivered to the acting superintendent in Yosemite Valley in time for use by the Board of Expert Advisers, at the time of their meeting in Yosemite Valley on November 1. While these pictures, I believe, satisfactorily served the board in making tentative studies of a development program in Tuolumne Meadows, I am advised by the Geological Survey that they will not serve for making the topographic survey intended to be made by the use of aerial photographs, so that even yet, our request for pictures suitable for an aerial photographic survey has not been met. Furthermore, on account of the lateness of the season, the Geological Survey requested the Air Corps to abandon the project.

Officers of the Geological Survey tell me that the flying personnel of the Air Corps are enthusiastic over this type of work and prosecute the assignments vigorously once the assignments are made.

W. B. LEWIS,
Assistant to the Director.

I am sure that the matter can be worked out in a way to be helpful to both the Air Service and the Geological Survey, as well as the Federal Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations herein made shall be available for payment of the costs of packing, crating, and transportation (including drayage) of personal effects of employees upon permanent change of station, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Total, United States Geological Survey, \$2,040,800.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would not detain the House except for the purpose of expressing my very great appreciation for the laborious services which the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CRAMTON] has given to the preparation of this bill. With painstaking care he has scrutinized every paragraph in it and required those under whose supervision the money is to be expended to justify every item in it. He has protected the Government's interest in every item and has been just in the consideration of all of them.

He has exhibited sound judgment and splendid business ability in the preparation of every item in this bill. He and the other members of the subcommittee met a number of days prior to the convening of Congress to begin the preparation of the bill, and it is due to their efforts that this bill was prepared and reported for early consideration during the present Congress. I want to commend him particularly for his earnest consideration and fair treatment of the large number of Indian tribes scattered for the most part throughout the Western States.

All of the items in the bill present an interesting study. The Indians are wards of the Government. They have been under the supervision of the Interior Department since that department was created in 1849. It is estimated that there are approximately 350,000 in the United States. To deal fairly and justly with all of the members of the various tribes is not an easy matter. The treaties and agreements or laws respecting each tribe may and do differ in some respects. Some tribes are more advanced than others. Some members of a particular tribe need the close supervision of the Government.

I want to make this statement in order to impress upon you that all tribes could not be similarly dealt with, and for that matter there is a vast difference in administration between the individual members of the same tribe. Mr. CRAMTON and the other members of the subcommittee have given painstaking care in their study of the Indian question, and I want to express my very great appreciation on behalf of the Indians of

the Nation and of my State for the generous treatment given the many items in the bill. I can not too highly commend each one of them. In my judgment, by far the most important items for consideration are appropriations for education and health work among the Indians. Of course their property must and should be preserved. We are, however, greatly interested in the development of the individual Indian so far as we can to make him a self-sustaining, productive citizen of the Republic. To do this the Indian citizen must acquire a knowledge of the English language. He must not only be taught the English language but he must learn to think in it.

This bill makes generous appropriations for the education of the Indian. There is recommended for appropriation out of the Federal Treasury for educational purposes \$7,994,000, and out of tribal funds \$1,149,000, or a total of \$9,143,000, being an increase of \$855,000 over the amount appropriated for educational purposes for the year 1929. There are many splendid Indian schools in the United States. They are doing a great work. The boys and girls attending these schools are given an industrial education. As to boarding schools, there are what is known as "reservation" and "nonreservation," and the expenses of some of these are paid out of the Federal Treasury, while the expenses of others are paid from their tribal funds, the distinction being whether any tribe has sufficient of its own tribal funds for the maintenance of the schools. In addition to the boarding schools, tuition is paid for the attendance of Indian children in public schools throughout the Western States. In my State of Oklahoma there is an appropriation of \$250,000 for the payment of tuition for Indian children, in lieu of taxes not collected from tax-exempt Indian lands, in the rural schools.

Before the convening of another session of Congress, it is the hope and expectation of the subcommittee to make a thorough study of this question with a view of determining the equitable amount that should be paid from the Federal Treasury in the support of rural schools in the several States, including my State of Oklahoma.

I am sure that a full and fair investigation will convince the subcommittee that larger appropriations should be made and that this amount will be increased at the next session of Congress. In Oklahoma 10 cents per day is paid for tuition for each Indian child attending rural schools. In other States the average is approximately 40 cents per day.

A number of boarding schools are maintained by both Federal and State funds for Indian pupils in Oklahoma, for which there is carried an appropriation in this bill, including the appropriation of \$250,000 for tuition in rural schools, amounting to a total of \$1,177,800.

The bill carries an appropriation for schools, both day and boarding schools, of \$1,177,800; for Chillico, \$232,500; for the Sequoyah Orphan Training School, \$93,000; for Bloomfield Academy, \$52,600; for Euclee, \$39,775; for Eufaula, \$58,625; for Haskell Institute, \$284,500. Of this amount, \$105,800 is for the benefit of Oklahoma Indians, inasmuch as 40 per cent of the children in attendance at Haskell Institute are from the Five Civilized Tribes. For Seneca, \$53,000, maintained from the lump-sum appropriation for schools. For the Osage Agency, \$8,000, payable from tribal funds. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in aid of the common schools of the Five Civilized Tribes and \$250,000 expended from the tribal funds of the Five Civilized Tribes, as follows: Seminole Nation, \$33,000; Chickasaw Nation, \$22,000; Choctaw Nation, \$195,000. Of this latter amount \$50,000 is for kitchen, dining hall, and auditorium at Wheelock Academy and \$3,000 for employees' cottage at Jones Male Academy. For school at Fort Sill, in addition to maintenance, \$15,000 is appropriated for additions to dormitories and \$21,500 for Cheyenne and Arapahoe schools for enlarging dormitories in addition to maintenance. These and other schools are maintained out of the lump-sum appropriation for Indian schools.

The bill carries an appropriation of \$120,000 for new hospitals in Oklahoma, as follows: For the Pawnee and Ponca Tribes, \$60,000; for an addition to the Kiowa Hospital at Lawton, \$60,000; and \$150,000 for the maintenance of the following hospitals: Cheyenne and Arapahoe Hospital, \$25,000; Choctaw and Chickasaw Hospital, \$45,000; Shawnee Sanatorium, \$48,000; Claremore Hospital, \$25,000; and Seger Hospital, \$7,000, or a total of \$270,000 for new construction and maintenance.

The office of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes is provided for in the lump-sum appropriation of \$925,000, out of which approximately \$203,000 is allocated to this agency. This office is placed under the civil service, as it should be, to remove it from the influence of partisan politics.

The bill carries many other items for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various tribes throughout the Western States, 33 of which are in Oklahoma. Of the approximately 350,000 Indians in this country, 123,000 are in my State of Oklahoma.

This bill authorizes for administrative purposes the expenditure of \$180,000 for the Osage Agency out of tribal funds and \$16,000 for the Quapaw Agency out of the Treasury.

There is carried in this bill an appropriation of \$243,211,000 for pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930. This is an increase of \$11,458,000 over last year.

There is appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$6,449,000; for the Geological Survey, \$2,040,800; for the National Park Service, which is being expanded and enlarged, \$8,340,940; for the Bureau of Education, including expenses in Washington and in Alaska, \$1,071,940. This bill carries an appropriation for the Federal expenses in the Territories and Alaska Railroad of \$1,419,600; for St. Elizabeths Hospital, \$1,430,000; for Columbia Institution for the Deaf, \$120,000; for Howard University, \$600,000; for Freedmen's Hospital, \$260,180. In addition, appropriations are carried for the office of the Secretary of the Interior aggregating \$917,000; for the General Land Office of \$2,159,400. The total amount carried for the Indian Service is \$16,472,103.02, which is an increase of \$2,187,594.02 over the amount appropriated for the past year.

The hope is that we may give the Indian an industrial education and ultimately free him of all supervision of every kind and character.

In Oklahoma there were 101,508 enrolled allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes. Approximately 9,000 of these allottees are now restricted or under the supervision of the Federal Government.

It is important to each State that the Indians be taught to be productive citizens of the State and Nation. That is the object of the Indian Bureau. That is the purpose for which these appropriations are made. We are making rapid strides to that end. Within approximately 25 years the Indian question will be entirely solved. Many people do not understand why the expenses for the Indians increase instead of decrease. The reason is that the Government is now attempting to deal with the Indians individually instead of collectively as tribes. Formerly the Indians had large acreages of land and lived upon reservations, and those in charge of the administration of Indian affairs came in contact with the Indians as tribes and not as individuals. Now the Indian Service is attempting to come in close contact with every individual restricted Indian in the hope that through encouragement and the lending of a helping hand he may be lifted to a plane of equality in every respect with his white neighbor with whom he comes in contact and with whom he must in a large measure compete. To do this the Government must teach him either individually on farms or through industrial training in boarding schools the value of his property and how to handle it. This requires sympathy and patient study on the part of a large number of employees. The friends of the Indian, who have given this question long and painstaking study, are convinced that this is the proper solution of the Indian question. Develop him through giving each individual Indian a little more responsibility, make him appreciate the value of his property, train him industrially in boarding schools, on the reservation, and on the farm. Slowly but gradually enable him to take up all the duties of citizenship.

Rapid progress has been made during the past 25 years. Let us not be too impatient. Let us keep in mind and always remember that the Indians must overcome all handicaps and not only acquire a knowledge of the English language, but we must learn to think in it as well. There have been many notable Indians in the past 100 years who have contributed to the enrichment of the citizenship of this Nation. I have frequently expressed the thought that it was of far greater importance to develop the individual Indian into a productive and honored citizen of the State and Nation than through technicalities assist him in accumulating more property at the expense of paying his honest obligations, thereby losing his own self-respect and the confidence of the people with whom he associates. There is not a parent in the Nation who would not rather see his boy or girl brought up to manhood and womanhood fully equipped for the duties of citizenship than to conserve his property at the expense of his educational and moral development.

The Indians are the wards of the Government, and they should, as I believe they do, receive the generous, sympathetic consideration of the Nation.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, to say just a word along the line of the remarks by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS]. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who has charge

of this bill, has not only performed a notable work in connection with the hearings and preparation of the bill but also by taking advantage of the information that he has thus gained has utilized it for the benefit of the House and the country by applying it to the consideration of other legislation. He diligently watches proposed legislation that would affect appropriations for the department which this bill provides for. What I have said regarding the gentleman from Michigan applies to other chairmen of subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], for instance, who sits before me, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy Department, in addition to his close attention to his own appropriation bill is always on the alert for bills affecting the department with which he has particularly to do on the Committee on Appropriations, and concerning which he is so well informed. Personally, I wish to thank these two gentlemen and the others who, like them, are doing this kind of work. It is work that ought to be genuinely appreciated by Congress and by the country.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah: For administration, protection, and maintenance, \$6,300; for construction of physical improvements, \$19,800, including not exceeding \$8,200 for the construction of buildings, of which \$4,000 shall be available for an employee's residence and \$3,600 for two comfort stations; in all, \$26,100.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is the first time that the item for Bryce Canyon National Park has appeared in an appropriation bill. I rise to express appreciation for the work that has been done in bringing this great area into the national park system. A few years ago three different agencies had supervision over the lands embraced in Bryce Canyon National Park. The Forest Service supervised part of it, and did some excellent work, too, in developing the area; built many fine roads leading up to the canyon. The State of Utah had jurisdiction over a part of the land and leased a part to the Union Pacific Railroad Co. It was seen long ago that it would be greatly to the advantage of the area if it were all embraced in a national park, and I rise to express a word of appreciation for the men who have cooperated in bringing about this happy result. The Union Pacific officials did their part, the officials of the State of Utah did their part, and the Forest Service and park service have cooperated splendidly.

Also in connection with what has been said, permit me to express a word of appreciation concerning the work of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], chairman of this committee for the work he has done. In Utah we appreciate very much the spirit of cooperation that has characterized all who have been connected with the bringing about of the creation of Bryce Canyon National Park. It is a wonderful area and is now added to the family of parks under the supervision of the National Park Service. One may now leave Cedar City, Utah, and go to Zion National Park, thence to the north rim of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado through the beautiful Klabab Forest and return via Bryce Canyon National Park and Cedar Breaks, and enjoy one of the most marvelous trips in the world. The Union Pacific system is spending millions to advertise and develop that whole area. With Bryce Canyon now a national park and with the completion of the Mount Carmel Road, we are looking forward to an era of great development. We appreciate this fine spirit of cooperation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Platt National Park, Okla.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, \$16,200.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWANK: Page 94, line 21, strike out the figures "\$16,200" and insert "\$18,000."

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases this appropriation reported in the bill by \$1,800, or up to \$18,000, the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amount each year appropriated includes not only administration, but some improvements, and for the current year there was necessity for a little more than that here proposed for the next year. I am not sure what the item was. It seems to me it was something about the water supply, but I am not sure about that, but I do know in 1928, \$12,096 was available at this park for administration and in 1929, \$14,400, and for 1930 that same amount. It seems to be sufficient to continue the administration, and I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since becoming a Member of Congress in 1921, I have worked at all times for an increased appropriation for Platt National Park, which is the only national park in Oklahoma. I am glad to say that these appropriations have been increased from \$6,000 in 1920 to \$18,000 for the present fiscal year, yet in this bill the Committee on Appropriations has recommended \$16,200 for the next fiscal year. Many times have I called the attention of this House to the greatness and usefulness of this park. It is not a large park, but, in my judgment, does more good to our citizens than any of our other parks, and they should be judged largely for their usefulness and not altogether by their size and beauty.

The visitors are checked at Bromide Springs, where the record is kept. Previous to 1926, the National Park Service, in arriving at the number of visitors at this park, divided the number reported by the superintendent by four as an estimate of visitors, for the reason that some people visited the park more than once. While that is done, it is also true that thousands of people visit this park and are never counted as they do not go to Bromide Springs, where they are checked. There are many kinds of water in the numerous springs and many visitors go there for the hot sulphur baths, for the other water, and for pleasure without visiting the springs where visitors are counted.

The number of visitors at our leading parks for the past three years, as shown in the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, is given in the following table:

Name of park	1926	1927	1928
Hot Springs (Ark.)	260,000	181,523	199,099
Yellowstone (Wyo.)	187,807	200,825	230,984
Sequoia (Calif.)	89,404	100,684	98,035
Yosemite (Calif.)	274,209	490,430	460,619
General Grant (Calif.)	50,597	47,996	51,988
Mount Rainier (Wash.)	161,796	200,051	219,531
Crater Lake (Oreg.)	89,019	82,354	113,323
Platt (Okla.)	124,284	294,954	280,638
Wind Cave (S. Dak.)	85,466	81,023	100,309
Sullys Hill (N. Dak.)	19,921	22,632	24,979
Mesa Verde (Colo.)	11,356	11,915	16,760
Glacier (Mont.)	37,325	41,745	53,454
Rocky Mountain (Colo.)	225,027	229,862	235,057
Hawaii (Territory of Hawaii)	35,000	37,551	78,414
Lassen Volcanic (Calif.)	18,739	20,089	26,057
Mount McKinley (Alaska)	533	651	802
Grand Canyon (Ariz.)	140,252	162,356	167,226
Lafayette (Me.)	101,256	123,699	134,897
Zion (Utah)	21,964	24,303	30,016
Total	1,930,865	2,354,643	2,522,188

During the years 1927 and 1928 but one national park had more visitors than Platt Park. This report shows that visitors in this park have increased from 27,023 in 1920 to 280,638 in 1928, and with adequate appropriations that number would be doubled. According to the reports of the Secretary of the Interior this year, Platt Park had more private automobiles entering it than any other park, with one exception. The automobiles entering the park have increased from 30,000 in 1922 to 70,000 in 1928. This place has been a noted health resort for many years, and long before Oklahoma Territory was opened to settlement. Before that time people went there for the medicinal properties of the water and get relief from their ailments. In Indian Territory days I have visited the section many times. In the more than 30 mineral springs you will find an abundance of sulphur, bromide, medicine, and pure water coming from the springs near each other. It is impossible to tell of the greatness and value of these waters in words. I wish you could see the many cures effected by these waters and hear the praise given by those who have been cured by their medicinal properties. People who visit the park find the waters an almost sure cure for all forms of digestive troubles, sleeplessness, skin diseases, and nervousness, and the black sulphur and hot sulphur baths are almost a sure cure for rheumatism. There are several fine swimming pools, excellently equipped and filled by pure sulphur water from deep artesian wells. This is not only a place where thousands are restored to health, but it is a place where people can enjoy themselves in other ways and by other sports. Near this park is the historic old Washita River that is not excelled by any river for fishing. The park is in the foothills of the Arbuckle Mountain Range and is a place of great natural beauty.

Adjacent to the park the State of Oklahoma erected its great soldiers' hospital for the care and treatment of our soldiers who were in the World War. The State has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the construction and maintenance of

this institution. The location was chosen by a committee of physicians after a most complete and thorough survey. Near the park is also located Oklahoma's School for the Deaf, which is one of the best of its kind in the country.

I wish the members of this committee could visit this park in the summer during the tourist season, and then you would be ready to provide more appropriations. It is not a local park but is national in its scope and in the good that it does. It is the duty of Congress to make adequate appropriations to maintain all our national parks, and Platt Park should be no exception. People of wealth visit this park, for they suffer with ailments as well as others. Most of the visitors are probably people of modest means, who can visit here and camp, if they like, free of charge in a healthy and sanitary location. Living conditions are reasonable and first class. It costs nothing to drink the water and bathe in the creeks entering the park. I favor a liberal program for our national parks for the benefit of our people who visit them.

Sulphur, the county seat of Murray County, where this park is located, is a community of energetic, Christian, law-abiding citizens, and they always extend a welcome to all visitors.

There is need of many improvements in this park in the way of additional bridges across the creeks, more improvement of the roads, extension of the sewer and water lines, more comfort stations, fencing, further improvements at the different springs, dams, drilling additional wells, improved camping grounds, and the erection of a new dwelling and office building for the superintendent and employees.

All that is needed to make this the most noted park in the United States and the largest in the number of visitors are adequate appropriations.

I have offered this amendment to only increase the appropriation for the next fiscal year to where it is for this year. The amount should not be reduced, and I sincerely hope that the committee will adopt my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rocky Mountain National Park, Colorado: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$1,300 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$82,400; for construction of physical improvements, \$13,600, including not exceeding \$7,500 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$2,000 shall be available for a stable, and \$4,000 for employees' quarters; in all, \$96,000.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my disapproval right now of the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

We are rapidly following in the footsteps of monarchy. The strength and beauty of this country have always lain in its simplicity. It was not the intention of the framers of the Constitution that we should have castles in the mountains and at the seashore for our President, but it was the intention that we should have one simple home at the seat of government, the White House; and right now I want to seriously express opposition to any tendency to have a king or royal palaces or royal families in this country. The President has a palatial yacht lying in the Potomac and a traveling fund for any visits, and we have gone far enough in providing luxuries for our Presidents.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yosemite National Park, Calif.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$3,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, not exceeding \$3,200 for maintenance of that part of the Wawona Road in the Sierra National Forest between the park boundary 2 miles north of Wawona and the park boundary near the Mariposa Grove of Big Trees, and not exceeding \$2,000 for maintenance of the road in the Stanislaus National Forest connecting the Tioga Road with the Hetch Hetchy Road near Mather Station, and including not exceeding \$10,000 for fire prevention and necessary expenses of a comprehensive study of the problems relating to the use and enjoyment of the Yosemite National Park and the preservation of its natural features, \$325,000; for construction of physical improvements, \$87,360, of which not to exceed \$4,000 shall be available for a ranger station and barn at Glacier Point, \$14,100 for three employees' cottages, and not to exceed \$4,000 for payment of balance of purchase price of electric transmission line constructed in the park in 1925 by the San Joaquin Light

& Power Corporation under contract with the Department of the Interior, dated May 21, 1924, and payments heretofore made to said corporation toward purchase of said electric transmission line under the contract heretofore referred to by supplying surplus electric energy produced by the Government hydroelectric plant are hereby authorized and confirmed; in all, \$412,360.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 96, in line 25, after the word "and," insert the word "including."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 96, in line 25, after the word "and," insert the word "including."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the fear has been expressed that as it stands the \$10,000 would be held to include the expenses of that commission as well as the fire prevention. The intention is that the \$10,000 is to be available for fire protection and then the expenses of the commission are taken care of out of the general amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Carlsbad Cave Monument, N. Mex.: For administration, protection, maintenance, development, and preservation, including not exceeding \$800 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general monument work, \$59,500; for construction of physical improvements, \$40,500, including not exceeding \$1,500 for an addition to the office building, \$4,000 for a power house, \$12,000 for additional water supply and water storage, \$12,000 for a sewage-disposal plant, and \$500 for a garage to be constructed in Carlsbad, N. Mex.; in all, \$100,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept that certain parcel of land in the town of Carlsbad, N. Mex., which has been tendered to the United States of America in fee simple, as a donation, for the site of superintendent's residence, and the appropriation of \$5,000 for the construction of a superintendent's residence, contained in the Interior Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1929 shall remain available until June 30, 1930.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the item carried in this bill to enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the provisions of the act of February 1, 1925, and also the act of May 22, 1926, which has to do with the establishment of the Great Smoky Mountain National Park in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee and the Shenandoah National Park of Virginia, is not a very large one, but it indicates that the department is getting ready to establish these two great parks. I was honored by the Public Lands Committee of the House by being put in charge of this legislation when it was passed by Congress. There were those of this body who felt that the Government was going into projects that would cost the taxpayers a great deal of money, but I am happy to inform the House and the country that large areas of land have been secured, and are about to be secured, to be turned over to the Government for these parks without expense. The park in which I am primarily interested is the Great Smoky Mountain National Park.

Out of an area of 704,000 acres lying within the boundary line selected and recommended by the Appalachian Park Commission after careful inspection of the area, in effect that a park of 427,000 acres should be established. The act prescribed that when title to lands within the area referred to shall have been vested in the United States in fee simple the park is established ready for administration, protection, and development by the United States. Under authority of the act, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, the National Park Service has made careful inspection of the area and pointed out to the States of North Carolina and Tennessee where the acquisition of 427,000 acres should lie.

The act further prescribes—

That the United States shall not purchase by appropriation of public moneys any land within the aforesaid areas, but that such land shall be secured by the United States only by public or private donation.

Based upon careful estimates prepared by the experts of the North Carolina and Tennessee Park Commissions it was figured

that the acquisition of the land for the park would require \$10,000,000. The citizens of North Carolina and Tennessee had pledged \$1,066,693. In addition the State of Tennessee had purchased about 76,000 acres which had been accepted at a valuation of \$500,000 and authorized a bond issue of \$1,500,000, making in all a contribution from these States in pledges of about \$5,000,000, one-half of the amount considered necessary to acquire the park.

When the splendid efforts of the people and official representatives of the States of North Carolina and Tennessee became known to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial the memorial fund established by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, sr., in memory of his beloved wife, for purposes of general good, that memorial, of which Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., is president, pledged up to \$5,000,000, matching dollar for dollar the funds made available in North Carolina and Tennessee.

The respective acts of the States of North Carolina and Tennessee prescribing the acquisition of the necessary land for this park by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise have been found constitutional in both States. The moneys authorized by both States are available, releasing an equal amount of donated funds. In both the Tennessee and North Carolina park areas some lumber cutting among the virgin timber is still going on, and strenuous efforts are being made by the respective park commissions to enjoin such further cutting in order that these scenic values may be saved. Considerable progress has been made in the acquisition of land by purchase. Every assistance possible under the laws has been given by the Interior Department, particularly through Col. Glenn Smith, who is a member and secretary of the Appalachian Park Commission, and Mr. Stephen Mather, Director of National Parks, and Mr. Cammerer, the Associate Director of the National Park Service, who have spared no time or effort to expedite this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The splendid assistance of the donors of the contributed funds is outstanding in its inspiration to the two States.

It is hoped that it will be only a matter of months now before the entire area necessary for the establishment of this park may be acquired, so that it may be tendered to and accepted by the Interior Department under the authorities of the various acts involved, and that thereby the southern Appalachian Range will contribute its wonderful share in adding its outstanding scenic attraction to that galaxy of national scenic wonders comprised in our national park and monument system. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the securing of lands in the southern Appalachian Mountains and in the Mammoth Cave regions of Kentucky for perpetual preservation as national parks," approved February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 958-959), the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia and the Great Smoky Mountain National Park in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1926 (U. S. C., p. 1936, sec. 403), and the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (U. S. C., p. 1936, sec. 404), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses of members and employees of the commission, printing and binding, and other necessary incidental expenses, \$3,000.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEMPLE: Page 100, line 2, at the end of the line, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "And the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the above-mentioned purpose for the fiscal year 1929 shall continue available during the fiscal year 1930."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to that amendment.

Mr. TEMPLE. If the chairman of the committee has no objection to it, I do not care to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to incorporate in my remarks a letter from the secretary of the Appalachian Park Commission bearing on the necessity of this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a letter from the secretary of the Appalachian Park Commission. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

RICHMOND, VA., December 13, 1928.

Hon. H. W. TEMPLE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOCTOR: I have just seen a copy of the Interior Department bill in which there is an item of \$3,000 to provide for the clerks' hire for our commission and the traveling expenses for the coming year.

At the time I made this estimate for funds to be expended during the coming year I had expected to use all the funds that had been made available for the commission's use for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929. Unfortunately, I was unable to secure the services of the Army Air Service to secure the photographs needed in connection with the establishment of the boundary line of the Shenandoah National Park. Therefore I have not expended any money for this work and have it available to expend when I can secure the services of the Army or, if necessary, contract with commercial firms for the work.

However, there is another complication which has arisen within the last few weeks in that it seems now necessary to actually survey the proposed boundary line of the Shenandoah National Park and mark it on the ground in accordance with the line as indicated by Mr. Cammerer on the map which we completed this year. This will necessitate our going into the field again and expending \$1,000 or \$1,500 to determine whether this would be the practical and feasible way to insure the State purchasing the land which has been designated as acceptable to the Government for national-park purposes.

To do this additional work it will take more money than the \$3,000 requested for next year's appropriation, and I am writing you to ask if you will see Mr. CRAMTON and have inserted on the floor of the House when the Interior bill is considered an amendment making the unexpended balance of our appropriation for the Southern Appalachian Park Commission which remains unexpended on June 30 be made available for use during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

With the expenses which we have in view between now and June 30, 1929, I do not believe there will be a balance of more than \$1,500 on June 30 that will be available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

Yours very sincerely,

GLENN S. SMITH.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The total of the foregoing amounts shall be immediately available in one fund for the National Park Service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not authorize for expenditure prior to July 1, 1929, any of the amounts herein appropriated except those for construction of physical improvements, for tree-disease and insect-control work in Crater Lake, Mesa Verde, and Lafayette National Parks, and for administration, protection, and maintenance of Bryce Canyon National Park: *Provided further*, That in the settlement of the accounts of the National Park Service the amount herein made available for each national park and other main headings shall not be exceeded, except that 10 per cent of the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably for expenditures in the various national parks named, and in the national monuments, but not more than 10 per cent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of said parks or monuments or for any particular item within a park or monument: *Provided further*, That any interchange of appropriations hereunder shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 101, after line 20, insert:

"For the acquisition of privately owned lands and/or standing timber within the boundaries of existing national parks and national monuments by purchase, or by condemnation under the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (U. S. C. p. 1302, sec. 257), whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior acquisition by condemnation proceedings is necessary or advantageous to the Government, \$250,000, to be expended only when matched by equal amounts by donation from other sources for the same purpose, to be available until expended: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may incur obligations and enter into contracts for additional acquisition of privately owned lands and/or standing timber in the

existing national parks and national monuments not exceeding a total of \$2,750,000 as matching funds from outside sources are donated for the same purpose, and his action in so doing shall be considered contractual obligations of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated and the appropriations herein authorized shall be available to reimburse any future donor of privately owned lands and/or standing timber within the boundaries of any existing national park or national monument to the extent of one-half the actual purchase price thereof: *Provided further*, That as part consideration for the purchase of lands, the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion and upon such conditions as he deems proper, lease lands purchased to the grantors for periods, however, not to exceed the life of the particular grantor, and the matching of funds under the provisions hereof shall not be governed by any cash value placed upon such leases: *Provided further*, That appropriations heretofore and herein made and authorized for the purchase of privately owned lands and/or standing timber in the national parks and national monuments shall be available for the payment in full of expenses incident to the purchase of said lands and/or standing timber."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman cares to reserve it, I would like to make a statement on the merits of the question and then I am sure the gentleman will not care to press any point of order that might lie against the amendment. A great deal of it is not subject to a point of order but some provisions are.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it is patent, from the reading of the amendment, that it is subject to a point of order. I want to put this proposition to the chairman of the subcommittee, because it is a matter that has been raised here several times in debate. If I, as a member of the Committee of the Whole, were to offer an amendment of this sort, I have no doubt the chairman of the subcommittee would very promptly make a point of order against it and insist on it.

Does the gentleman from Michigan think that the chairman of the subcommittee is setting a very fair example to be followed by the ordinary member of the Committee of the Whole when he constantly presents amendments that are patently subject to a point of order and that constitute new legislation? That is the question I want to raise, because it seems to me it is a matter of some importance to protect the procedure and integrity of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Specifically for the purpose of having the chairman of the subcommittee answer my inquiry.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am glad to do so, although, perhaps, not at as great length as I might some other time. The amendment has for its purpose the purchase of private lands in national parks. There is authority of law for that purpose. We could report here an amendment to spend \$5,000,000 of cash for that purpose and it would not be subject to a point of order. The authority already exists for that. Now, to safeguard the Treasury, in making such an appropriation, this item has been worked out. In the main it is not subject to a point of order, but there are some provisions that are in themselves minor as compared with the paragraph as a whole, but rather essential to it in its complete working out.

Our committee does not recommend legislation as such, but sometimes, where an expenditure of money authorized by law is desirable, it is desirable also to safeguard the Treasury by having some safeguards thrown around it. I would be glad to have the gentleman see fit to withdraw the point of order and then I will proceed to discuss the merits of it. I am sure that in this case the gentleman from Alabama will be absolutely in accord with the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, Mr. Chairman, in the beginning I said it was not my purpose to really make the point of order, but I will ask the gentleman this further question: In instances of this sort, where it is patent that a violation of the rules is indulged in and legislation is brought in that has no legislation to support it, is it the policy of the chairman of the subcommittee to recommend to the legislative committee, in instances of this sort, remedial legislation that might make impossible the constant violation of the rules of the House with reference to items of this sort?

Mr. CRAMTON. Where it is possible, I will say, our committee works in close harmony with the legislative committees, and at my request the chairman elect of the committee that would have this in charge is on the floor, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Colton]. He is thoroughly in sympathy with it and is prepared to support the amendment. It is not enacting far-reaching legislation.

The authority is already there to buy these lands and to spend exclusively Government funds, but we are trying to

arrange, I will state to the gentleman, to allow private individuals to stand half of the expense, and some details had to be worked out to meet that extraordinary situation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am willing to follow the gentleman's judgment on the practical phases of the bill and my real purpose in rising was to have the gentleman make a statement along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. CRAMTON. Answering the last question propounded by the gentleman, I will say that if something is of a legislative character and there seems to be an emergency we consult with the chairman of the legislative committee involved.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I feel this is of such far-reaching importance, and there are some reasons why there should be some record in connection with it, that I want to take about five minutes, and perhaps a few minutes more, to put this situation before you.

I am tremendously interested in this amendment. There is nothing of greater importance to our national-park system today than the program that is proposed in this amendment. In all our national parks our committee have found privately owned lands. We have found that those privately owned lands frequently get in the way of the desirable development of the parks. That can happen either because the people who own them make an undesirable use of them, as compared with the park use, or that we want to develop the lands and can not do it because we do not own them.

So three or four years ago our committee commenced its study of this matter. Two years ago an item of \$50,000 for purchasing such lands was put in the bill without a Budget estimate, providing that private funds should match the Government appropriation for this purpose. Thereby we established what seemed to be a desirable policy with reference to this proposition. Last year the Budget accepted this policy and recommended \$50,000 more, which was appropriated.

In the meantime a survey of the situation has been carried on by the park service, with the result that a report has been made that it will probably cost from \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 to acquire these private holdings in all of the national parks. This report appears in the hearing.

The most acute situation in the national parks is in the Yosemite National Park.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a very acute situation in the Yosemite National Park. Eight thousand five hundred acres of land within that park, bearing some of the very best sugar pine and other pine in California, is owned privately and the holdings have been consolidated in one owner, who is operating his lumbering operations in that vicinity. Within a few weeks, or within the coming summer at the most, he will begin cutting the timber in this tract. The most important roads in that part of the park will go through this 8,500 acres or 13 square miles of timber. The Big Oak Flat Road for four miles will traverse this section. All the Tioga Road travel as well as from the Stockton country will come into Yosemite this way. The new road, which the city of San Francisco is to build, from Mather Station to Harding Lake, will go through it for two or three miles. This road, running for four miles along the south rim of the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne will give a view of half the great Yosemite Park area and will provide a wonderful scenic route. Where there is now this beautiful timber, if you delay a few months longer, there will be only stumps to line these highways for several miles. It is a situation that does not permit further delay.

We have therefore been delighted because private sources have offered a contribution of \$1,000,000 to be matched by Government funds, particularly for this Yosemite situation, the balance to be used in other parks. We want to make available this \$1,000,000 that has now been offered, so that the cutting of this timber this summer can be prevented.

At the same time, we have reason to hope that if the Government manifests its definite policy and purpose to go ahead with this program, the entire contribution of \$3,000,000 from private funds will be forthcoming. This is the purpose of the amendment and the language of the amendment is sufficiently broad to accomplish the purpose. I would like to have offered an amendment here for \$1,000,000, but we can not absorb that in this bill. We can absorb the amount that has been suggested.

This makes it possible for the private donor to acquire these lands and later for us to acquire them at half the price that he pays for them, and later appropriations herein authorized can probably be somewhat deferred.

I will ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and, Mr. Chairman, in so doing, I will want to include a telegram from Francis P. Farquhar, of San Francisco, representing the Sierra Club of California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. The telegram is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., December 13, 1928.

HON. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We are deeply concerned over threatened destruction Yosemite forests through cutting of private lands, which we understand likely to occur next spring unless purchased for Government ownership. Sierra Club at annual meeting last Saturday considered this most urgent problem confronting us and voted use every endeavor to arouse nation-wide action to prevent such disaster. We believe part of purchase funds can be raised by subscription, but task too large and time too short for accomplishment without Government aid. We have heard that appropriation is contemplated and hope this is true.

FRANCIS P. FARQUHAR.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction, etc., of roads and trails: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park and the international boundary, and the Grand Canyon Highway from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park as authorized by the act approved June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 423), and including that part of the Wawona Road in the Sierra National Forest between the Yosemite National Park boundary 2 miles north of Wawona and the park boundary near the Mariposa Grove of Big Trees, and that part of the Yakima Park Highway between the Mount Rainier National Park boundary and connecting with the Cayuse Pass State Highway, to be immediately available and remain available until expended, \$5,000,000, which includes \$4,000,000, the amount of the contractual authorization contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1929, approved March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 237, 238): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$18,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1930: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also approve projects, incur obligations, and enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of \$2,500,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction of roads in national parks and monuments shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligation so created.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item for the construction of highways in the national parks brings to my mind a question which I would like to propound to the chairman of the committee with regard to the plan for the completion of what is known as the Transmountain Highway through the Glacier National Park.

At the present time, as I understand it, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000 has been expended for the construction of this road from the western side of Glacier Park to the top of Logan Pass, and provision has been made for its completion on the eastern side as far as the Going-to-the-Sun Chalets, leaving about 7 miles not now provided for in the center of the park. The completion of that 7 miles is necessary to give the people of this country the full value of this tremendous expenditure on the part of the United States. I would greatly appreciate a statement as to the plans for its completion, and the reasons why the completion is not now provided for in this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the Transmountain Road is one which the gentleman from Montana and I have visited on several occasions. We went over the proposed route of the road three years ago and went over the uncompleted portion of it this fall. At that time I think we suggested it should be named the Going-to-the-Sun Highway, a very attractive and very fitting name, because for miles it works around the Going-to-the-Sun

Mountain, and in the main it is an east and west route. The west end of this road along Lake McDonald traverses land in the park which is almost entirely privately owned. As soon as this highway is completed there will be great travel over it of people going to the coast, and if we complete the highway and then proceed to buy the private holdings, we will have to pay a large amount additional because of the increased value caused by the construction of the highway.

It has been the position of the committee that we would not provide for the completion of the highway until we owned the private lands. It seems shortsighted business when we have use for the money for roads elsewhere to push up the price of these lands by rushing this road to completion.

This question emphasizes the importance of the amendment just adopted. If that goes through I am very hopeful that there will go along with the Yosemite provision a clean up of the situation around Lake McDonald. As soon as that is cleared up, we are in a position to go ahead and build the Glacier Road.

I think this should be said as to the road situation: The bill appears to be on an annual \$5,000,000 basis. It is, in fact, on a basis of three million and a half this year, because while there is \$5,000,000 cash appropriation, only \$1,000,000 is free, and \$4,000,000 is for previous contracts.

When we considered the matter last year, providing authority to contract for \$4,000,000, and the question was gone over with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Madden, that authority was given with the understanding that a supplemental estimate of one to two million dollars would come in this fall. That supplemental estimate has not come in, and so it is all to be taken out of this appropriation; so this leaves only three million and a half dollars as a basis for this year, including the \$1,000,000 of free cash and the new authority to contract for \$2,500,000. I hope something can be done for the Glacier Park, together with the Going-to-the-Sun Highway, and it can be if the private-holding situation is taken care of.

Mr. LEAVITT. What is the plan this year so far as completing the road is concerned?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is my understanding that the road will remain in status quo until the private land situation is cleared up.

Mr. LEAVITT. Where does the initiative lie in clearing it up? Is there any legislation we have passed which makes an appropriation to be matched?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the gentleman from Montana? Of course, the gentleman from Montana, and no one else, wants the Government of the United States to be put in the attitude where it would be unconscionably held up. As the chairman intimated, if we go ahead and build a magnificent highway through these private lands when the Government comes to buy the land the price will be limited only by the blue sky. We feel that there ought to be something done by the State of Montana whereby we can know that these people would be rightfully and fairly compensated by the Government, but that the Government would not be imposed upon.

In one of the Government reclamation projects there is a large amount owned by a railroad company, and we are building a project which will make it enormously valuable. We have had the price fixed by an appraisement so that there will be no injustice or controversy about it. If something of that kind or some understanding could be had in Montana to protect the Federal Treasury it would have the appreciation of at least one minority member on the committee. I do not want to hold up the work and yet I do not like the idea of encouraging outrageous profiteering when we are rendering that country a wonderfully beneficial service.

Mr. LEAVITT. The position taken by the gentleman from Colorado and other members of the subcommittee would be much more tenable if it had been taken five or six years ago. As to expending money on reclamation projects bringing up the price of land it is true mistakes have been made in the past, but that gives no foundation for this.

In this particular case the Federal Government has already spent over a million dollars, if I am not mistaken. We have constructed that highway to the Continental Divide to Logan Pass on the west and have started it on the east side of the park. If we can add to the price of these lands by road construction, then we have already greatly added to that price. We are dealing here with a situation which to a great extent existed before we began the construction of that road.

I agree that as a matter of good general policy within the national parks there might well be an acquiring of private lands in order that the people of this country may be guaranteed national-park standards in the handling of those lands. I understand that law already exists giving to the Federal Government

power to condemn lands under situations of that kind, or perhaps to determine the character of the improvement and the way in which to a certain extent those lands should be handled within the national parks; but I believe that the construction of this highway, with this great expenditure of money already made, with the cost of maintaining a road already partly constructed, should not be unduly delayed, but that the Federal Government, having put itself in the position of already spending that tremendous amount of money, can not now come in and say to the State of Montana, we are not going to move until you do something which was not even considered at the time the road was started, or that private individuals in Montana must do something not then contemplated. The Federal Government ought to take the initiative along the line proposed in the amendment recently written in this bill, and we ought to give to the people who do now own lands on Lake McDonald some sort of protection and terms under which those purchases will be made, which will look to the future and allow them to use the land they now own for the purposes, within reasonable limits, for which they were acquired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. From my personal contact I know of the continued, active, and effective interest the gentleman from Montana has in this highway and in the park generally. I first met him in that park in 1920. I am very hopeful that under the amendment just adopted a situation will work out that will satisfactorily take care of this proposition. The amendment just adopted provides for giving back a life lease to those who have cottages there, because the Government can afford to wait if no undesirable use is made of them. I hope the situation will work out satisfactorily. In the meantime, any money not spent on that road is being spent to splendid advantage on some other road.

Mr. LEAVITT. Would I be safe in assuming, then, that if under the law as it now exists these lands are purchased, the present owners as, for example, some who now use cottages as a protection for their lives from hay fever, would be protected in that use during the lifetime of the present owners and that the lands would be taken only after that use has been completed?

Mr. CRAMTON. If reasonable terms for the purchase can be arranged, there would be no difficulty about arranging for life leases for the same use that they have been making of the lands before that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital for the Insane from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, civilians in the quartermaster service of the Army, persons transferred from the Canal Zone who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, and beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau, including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, and including not to exceed \$150,000 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, \$955,000, including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding \$1,500 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers, for which payment may be made in advance, as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding \$1,500 for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates who are not or who cease to be properly chargeable to Federal maintenance in the institution and in returning them to such places of residence: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1930 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent, upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be

agreed upon between the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition by the disbursing agent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the practice of allowing quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry service to the superintendent and other employees who are required to live at St. Elizabeths Hospital may be continued without deduction from their salary, notwithstanding the act of March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. p. 193).

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the provision, beginning in line 15, page 114, which reads as follows: "*Provided further*, That the practice of allowing quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry service to the superintendent and other employees who are required to live at St. Elizabeths Hospital may be continued without deduction from their salary, notwithstanding the act of March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. p. 193)," for the reason that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I admit it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Texas withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman want to defend this?

Mr. FRENCH. Not the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. This proposition?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think we ought to stay here for that. It is after dark now.

Mr. FRENCH. Just let me have a couple of minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I want to condemn this situation, so I shall ask for two or three more minutes after that. That prolongs the situation. Let it rest where it is. The paragraph giving allowances has gone out of the bill on my point of order. There are others who want to condemn this proposition also.

Mr. SCHAFER. I will need about half an hour to bring the facts to the House.

Mr. BLANTON. It would take an hour to properly condemn the situation.

Mr. FRENCH. I recognize the force of the point of order. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this point. I think the House ought to have the facts before it upon which the committee acted.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman incorporate in his remarks the total amount of the people's money that has been used for four servants each year by the superintendent of the institution in violation of law?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman can make his own statement and his own remarks. I have my statement to make and I have asked to extend. I am not caring whether he objects to the extension or not.

Mr. SCHAFER. I do not object. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner and upon the subject indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks upon the same subject. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 112, beginning in line 20, I move to strike out the following language:

Including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent—

Mr. CRAMTON. This is for the use not alone of the superintendent but the purchasing agent and general hospital business.

Mr. BLANTON. I will modify my amendment if the gentleman will permit and simplify the matter. I move to strike out the following words: In line 22 strike out "passenger-carrying," and in line 23 strike out "superintendent." That simplifies it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is logical even if it is not wise.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 112, line 22, strike out the words "passenger-carrying," and in line 23 strike out the word "superintendent."

Mr. BLANTON. On that I ask for recognition.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman just asked Members to refrain from speeches. Be as good a sport as the rest.

Mr. BLANTON. That was something not before the House.

Mr. MURPHY. Be a good sport. The gentleman is complaining about time. It is now three minutes of 5; be a good sport.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield to the dry gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman is speaking about being a good sport; be one.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to use my own time in my own way. If you gentlemen will get the report on the investigation by Congress of one of our own House committees in reference to this institution and its superintendent more than twenty-odd years ago and read it, you will find this committee of ours then condemned this superintendent for the number of passenger-carrying vehicles he then had in his stables for his own use and the use of his own family.

I wish you would read just how many he had there and how many servants it took and what was paid by the people of this Government to take care and maintain them for his personal use. He was condemned then, and he has been condemned time after time for it. Go out there and see what he has for his own private use now, and here is \$27,000 more you are giving him. If he wants to do it he can spend every single dollar of it for limousines in addition to the ones he has now. If you want to do it, go ahead. I am doing my duty when I call attention to it.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is any of this appropriation of \$27,000 for passenger vehicles which are used to take the incompetent patients and veterans out riding?

Mr. BLANTON. No. The only thing I am seeking to do—I know the committee will not accept it; you will vote it down, but I am putting it up to you—the only thing I am trying to do is to take the passenger part out of it and let the appropriation stand for such use as the institution needs.

Go out there and look at his big limousines that he now uses and which are furnished to him for his own use. Look at the other elegant cars that are furnished to him. I do not want to see any part of this \$27,000 to be used by him. I can not stop this, but I have the satisfaction of having knocked out of the bill the \$11,000 sought to be given him for allowances, as the Chair sustained my point of order against same.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman is recognized in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken upon this bill for the reason that I understood it was a western bill and that eastern and southern Members are not supposed to butt in. I do not fall under the denomination of a "sport," good or bad, and, consequently, I am going to speak for about two minutes.

A point of order, as I understand it, was made against the provision for quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry service to the superintendent and other employees who are required to live at St. Elizabeths Hospital. I want to rise in opposition to the proposition urged here on the floor of giving employment in institutions like St. Elizabeths and then withholding laundry service and other expenses that are necessary in order to keep the employees in a satisfied state of mind. I am opposed to making them pay for those services. If the service over there is not what it should be, those employees ought to be dismissed from the service.

I do not know the superintendent. I have never been on the grounds, but I understand the employees there are competent and render efficiently a most exacting service.

I once heard the statement made in the Louisiana Legislature when I was a member years ago by a fellow member who subsequently gained a national reputation through a paper read before or at a meeting of the American Bar Association to the effect that subjects like these and the discussion of them was so trivial as to resemble cracking nuts and fleas, to use an inelegant but forceful expression. We should devote our attention to matters of larger import than the insignificant matter against which the point of order was made and the insignificant amount involved, and we should give relief to employees that are not overpaid, and give them a little light, and a little allowance for expenses. Employment in an insane asylum is not of the most desirable nature. The work calls for patience, understanding, and a God-given sympathy with the afflicted.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has overlooked the point that we are furnishing to this man \$19,000 worth of service.

Mr. SCHAFER. Does the gentleman think that the violation of existing law and the incurrence of illegal expenses are trifling matters?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I have heard of those things that are too small for the attention of able legislators like my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and my friend [Mr. SCHAFER] from Wisconsin.

If the superintendent is guilty of the offenses named, he should be incontinentally fired. If the employees have not the ability, the sympathy, or the requirements, they should be released from a service that calls for the best that is in human nature. To cut off employees in this asylum from the only comforts that makes his position tolerable is not discipline. It is merely evidencing a lack of wisdom. Release the job holder if incompetent, but do not make the job so unattractive to competent men that they will not seek the position.

Many of the comptroller's rulings have been so drastic as to make them unreasonable and utterly at variance with common sense. The extreme of the law is the extreme of injustice. The laws of the Medes and Persians were so inflexible and inelastic and so rigidly construed that they became a synonym for injustice, intolerance, tyranny, oppression, and brutality.

Mr. FRENCH rose.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes; 5 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and 5 to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. This proviso is already out.

Mr. SCHAFER. Not at this point.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I can not remain quiet when severe criticisms are made against an institution that you must care for in the pending bill and in such a way that they are criticisms of the committee itself in the work that it has done. If the superintendent and employees of St. Elizabeths Hospital are not what they ought to be, there are ways to get rid of them. If we must maintain St. Elizabeths Hospital, it should be maintained in a way that is worthy of the patients who are there and of the dignity of our country.

St. Elizabeths is one of the world's greatest institutions of its kind. Doctor White, the head of the institution, is recognized as one of the foremost psychiatrists.

When Rear Admiral Stitt, who for years has been the Surgeon General of the United States Navy and who is president of the board of visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital, was before our committee he quoted Doctor Kraepelin, whom he characterized as "probably the most famous man in psychiatry in the world," as saying "of all institutions in the world that he had visited, St. Elizabeths was the most efficient."

Doctor White has been superintendent of that institution for more than 25 years.

Many years ago, and before Superintendent White took charge, the Congress, by law, provided that the superintendent should live upon the grounds of the institution. This is a policy that is followed by practically all of the institutions for mental cases within the United States and in foreign countries. It is not a pleasant place to live, but it is the place where the superintendent ought to live if he is to do the right thing by those under his charge. This being so, he is virtually upon duty, or must be ready for duty, 24 hours per day. Not only should the superintendent live at the hospital but other doctors and other employees, who have the care of patients, ought to live at the hospital if they are to render the most efficient service.

We have a plant at St. Elizabeths that is worth something like \$5,500,000. We have a farm of more than 800 acres. Last year on that farm we produced for the institution food supplies worth more than \$200,000.

At St. Elizabeths we are caring for men and women who are ill, who are broken mentally. Last year we cared for more than 4,700, with a daily average of 4,143.

To care for this institution, the patients as the objective, requires money, and we ought not to limit the administration of the institution by denying the money that the Department of the Interior tells us is necessary for motor-propelled vehicles and to which the gentleman's amendment is directed. These vehicles are for the use of the superintendent, the purchasing agent, and the general hospital business.

"The gentleman who spoke just a moment ago referred to the home where the superintendent lives. May I say that the superintendent lives where he is required to live under the law. It is not of his own volition. It is not a very happy or attractive place to live. The superintendent, any superintendent, is required by law to "reside on the premises."

For many years, and before the present superintendent took charge, this officer was assigned quarters in one of the large buildings of the institution, a building used for hospital purposes. More than that, the quarters assigned to him are not assigned to him personally, but they are a part of the institution and are for official use. This institution is visited constantly by representatives of similar institutions throughout the country, and from foreign countries.

The institution is in a sense a laboratory where we are seeking out the best ways to relieve suffering human kind. What would you have the superintendent do; dismiss these many visitors who are interested in the care of those afflicted mentally?

What you call the superintendent's house is the quarters as well, provided for just such visitors. They occupy rooms there and they have their meals.

For St. Elizabeths we have provided a board of visitors. The members of the board are given by law responsible work. They visit the institution from time to time, and when they do they are officers of the institution.

The room that is the board's room and where their meetings are held is one of these same rooms that we are told belongs to the superintendent. Another is the superintendent's study, where he checks up on the experiences of the day. What critics have called the dining room of the family of the superintendent is where members of the board and visitors to the institution have their meals.

Again, that the doctors and nurses at this hospital may be abreast of the times, specialists are called in for discussions and lectures. These specialists are not the personal guests of the superintendent, they are the guests of the institution.

A situation exists here somewhat similar to that which exists at Annapolis and West Point, where we make special appropriations for the case of guests and visitors to these institutions. The situation is quite similar to that which exists in every university and educational institution of the country, where visitors and special lecturers are made the guests of the institution, though maybe being housed in the president's home and dining at his table.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. And even if the gentleman from Texas were correct in his estimate as to Doctor White personally and professionally, if he, as the head of this institution, were to leave the institution or be dismissed the effect of the point of order would make it quite impossible to get a physician of proper standing in his place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For completion of the medical and surgical building, \$475,000, including cost of supervision of work and including the removal and reconstruction of the isolation building.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] who defends the committee in this matter, what is the proportion of employees to patients in St. Elizabeths Hospital?

Mr. FRENCH. The question is not involved here in so far as this particular paragraph is concerned.

Mr. GILBERT. The gentleman has the information?

Mr. FRENCH. I have the information here. The number of patients last year receiving treatment was 4,727 with an average number of 4,143. Then we have of physicians 33—

Mr. GILBERT. Give me the whole amount. The gentleman is taking up all my time.

Mr. FRENCH. Is the gentleman proposing to classify as one group the doctors and laborers who work in the gardens—

Mr. GILBERT. All the employees there, doctors and laborers of all kinds. What is the proportion of employees to patients?

Mr. FRENCH. Thirty-three doctors, 678 graduate nurses, other employees including some who are trained specialists, making a total of 1,238.

Mr. GILBERT. That brings out exactly what I wanted to bring out. That is 1 employee to 4 patients. Our hearings showed and it is the truth, that the general average throughout

the United States is less than 1 to 7, under the same circumstances as here. The gentleman spoke of the farm. I have no personal animus in this matter at all, but they have there several times as many as are necessary and as are customary and usual to run a farm. They have 1 man to every 10 or 15 cows, when 1 man for 25 cows is enough. As I have said, I have no personal feeling in this matter at all. They have too many employees of every kind, they consume too much, their treatment is inhuman, they have killed patients in corrections and altogether this is the most expensively run and the most outrageously conducted hospital in the United States.

Their records are not kept correctly.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the gentleman know the average cost per patient in other institutions?

Mr. GILBERT. I had all that before me and this is by far the most expensively run hospital in the United States. The average cost is not \$500 and here it is over seven hundred.

Mr. FRENCH. The average cost per patient per day for the current year will be less than \$2, and for the fiscal year 1930 the estimate is \$1.81 per day.

Mr. GILBERT. I want to make this further statement in summation: Public indignation caused former Commissioner Fenning to resign by reason of the fact that he was exploiting the shell-shocked veterans of the World War. If that was justifiable, then there is no reason why Doctor White is not subject to the same criticism, because he not only furnished the means but he furnished the cooperation in a vast majority of all those cases.

This man has been under the constant fire of Congress for more than 20 years. It is not a recent development of some special committee that the gentleman might feel has animus, but he has been under successful criticism for more than 20 years.

Two years ago I called attention by facts and figures to some inexcusable conduct in this institution—falsification of records and many other irregularities—that ought not to be permitted. Why his resignation is not called for and why he is continually defended in the face of sworn facts is more than I can understand.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that not only the District Committee of 21 members but the Judiciary Committee both unanimously agreed that there was an unholy alliance between Fenning and Doctor White in all these matters?

Mr. GILBERT. Why, absolutely.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is not the fact that the Comptroller General's decision clearly shows that he illegally expended the people's money for his own personal benefit, in the amount of thousands of dollars, sufficient justification to kick him out at this time?

Mr. GILBERT. The records further showed and it was admitted before our committee that they put opposite the names of men who had escaped and had never been found, "Cured; released." The whole thing is a falsification and a sham and the conduct of this hospital is inexcusable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Howard University, \$600,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and in doing so I wish to include the law which has just been signed by the President authorizing such appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. The law which was signed by the President yesterday is as follows:

That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia," approved March 2, 1867, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. Annual appropriations are hereby authorized to aid in the construction, development, improvement, and maintenance of the university, no part of which shall be used for religious instruction. The university shall at all times be open to inspection by the Bureau of Education and shall be inspected by the said bureau at least once each year. An annual report making a full exhibit of the affairs of the university shall be presented to Congress each year in the report of the Bureau of Education."

By reason of this new law no points of order have been made to-day against proposed appropriations for Howard, and none are in order against appropriations for the "construction, development, improvement, and maintenance" of that institution. Because of the annual points of order, even though the items were later restored, no definite and constructive policy could be followed, and the financial support of that growing institution was very uncertain. By reason of the experience of our committee in this regard, I drafted a bill to authorize appropriations for Howard University and introduced it in the House in December, 1924, and each Congress thereafter. It now becomes law in the identical form in which I introduced it four years ago.

The future of Howard University as the great colored educational center for America is therefore now well assured, and its leadership of that race will have a far-reaching effect on our country in the years to come.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDELOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15089) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CRAMTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 14801) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. MOSES, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. HARRIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MOSES, Mr. HALE, and Mr. OVERMAN members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate, as provided by Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, providing for the appointment of a joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President elect of the United States on the 4th of March next.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution limiting the operation of sections 198 and 203 of title 18 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee reported the bill (H. R. 15386) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. BUCHANAN reserved all points of order.

ADJOURNMENT FOR THE HOLIDAYS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I send the following resolution to the Clerk's desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 45

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, December 22, 1928, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Thursday, January 3, 1929.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the minority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], before he went away agreed to this resolution. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], now substituting for him, also agrees to it; and both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate have agreed to recommend the same resolution to the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WOLFENDEN (at the request of Mr. DARROW), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 346. An act authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1928, on the 20th day of that month.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 15, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, December 15, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To amend the packers and stockyards act, 1921 (H. R. 13596).

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting of the subcommittee to consider a bill for the relief of J. F. McMurray (H. R. 10741).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

685. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to \$500,000 for the fiscal year 1930, for an additional amount for the eradication of tuberculosis in animals (H. Doc. No. 476); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

686. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting recommendation that the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise a site and building for the accommodation of the United States Subtreasury and other governmental offices at New Orleans, La., be repealed; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7031. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States for the education, medical attention, and relief of distress of Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 15386. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) to authorize an appropriation to pay claims of parents of deceased and injured children killed and injured by an Army airplane landing in Patterson Park, Baltimore, Md., on or about August 14, 1919, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 15378) to authorize the transfer to the line of the Navy of certain officers of the Construction Corps who are employed on aeronautical duties; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 15379) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows of certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 15380) to establish, maintain, and operate a reforesting station in the first congressional district of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15381) to provide for the establishment of a light vessel at Grays Harbor, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15382) to legalize a trestle, log dump, and booming ground in Henderson Inlet, near Chapman Bay, about 7 miles northeast of Olympia, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 15383) to amend the first subdivision of section 4 of the naturalization act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 15384) making it a penal offense to refer to the religion of a candidate for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 15385) to regulate the use of spray-painting compressed-air machines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15386) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 15387) to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 15388) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce in foreign countries, and to encourage the industries in the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 15389) to amend the salary rates contained in the compensation schedules of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field service," and the Welch Act, approved May 28, 1928, in amendment thereof; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 15390) granting authority to the Secretary of War to relocate levee of Conway District No. 1, Conway County, Ark.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15391) making an appropriation for improving the Arkansas River from Little Rock, Ark., to the point where it flows into the Mississippi River, for the purposes of navigation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 351) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 352) for the relief of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 353) providing for a joint committee to investigate and report upon facts connected with the sinking of the S. S. *Vestris*; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KIESS: Resolution (H. Res. 263) providing for the printing of the Journal of the Thirtieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FISH: Resolution (H. Res. 264) favoring the ratification by the United States Senate of the Kellogg peace pact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 15392) granting a pension to Elfred P. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15393) granting a pension to Bridget O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15394) granting a pension to William Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15395) granting a pension to Grant E. Q. Leatherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 15396) granting a pension to Mary Jane Eagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 15397) for the relief of Floyd Dillon, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 15398) granting a pension to Mary Jane Chetney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 15399) granting a pension to William Hecker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15400) granting a pension to Martha F. Stigall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 15401) granting an increase of pension to Abbie M. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 15402) granting retirement annuity or pension to Hiram Elliott; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15403) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Della; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 15404) to compensate Arthur Ashley Burn, sr., for the loss and death of his son, Arthur A. Burn, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 15405) to correct the military record of James Luther Hammon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15406) granting a pension to Emma A. Safley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 15407) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15408) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 15409) granting an increase of pension to Agnes B. Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15410) granting a pension to Julia Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 15411) granting a pension to Edward G. Murton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15412) granting a pension to Ann C. Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORMAN: A bill (H. R. 15413) granting a pension to Jesse Burnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 15414) granting a pension to Herman Lyons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15415) granting a pension to Robert C. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15416) granting a pension to Jesse A. Sparks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15417) granting an increase of pension to Floyd Lipton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15418) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 15419) granting an increase of pension to Quessie Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 15420) granting an increase of pension to Louise L. Pettengill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15421) for the relief of D. B. Heiner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 15422) granting a pension to Rosetta B. Munsel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 15423) granting an increase of pension to Orpha Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 15424) for the relief of Dr. W. H. Parsons; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 350) to provide for the reappointment of Frederic A. Delano and Irwin B. Laughlin as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7975. By Mr. BEERS: Petition from citizens of Perry County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 11410; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7976. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution presented at annual meeting of the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, expressing the appreciation of the generous attitude of Congress toward the blind pupils in the schools in this country; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7977. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Dewey Congressional Medal Men's Association, urging support of House bill 12247 and Senate bill 1265, proposing a reward of \$30 per month to the few surviving officers and enlisted men who served with Commodore George Dewey at his famous victory in Manila Bay; to the Committee on Pensions.

7978. Also, letter from F. D. Fant, chairman traffic department, United States Fisheries Association, Jacksonville, Fla., urging support of House Resolution 303; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7979. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, opposing further grants of public lands within State of New Mexico to Indians or Indian tribes, unless lands so granted to Indians or Indian tribes be put on the State tax rolls; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

7980. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, indorsing and recommending the leasing of the public domain in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7981. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring the purchase of isolated tracts of Government lands for grazing purposes, minimum price at which such tracts of land, grazing in character, to be 50 cents per acre; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7982. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, expressing appreciation for services rendered beef-cattle producers by Department of Agriculture, the National Live Stock and Meat Board, and the Better Beef Association, and favoring increase of 25 cents per car on all cattle sold, the funds to be used by the National Meat Board for increased advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7983. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, urging increased appropriation for salary of Chief of Bureau of Animal Industry, and asking sufficient funds for the study and control of livestock diseases and pests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7984. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, urging increased appropriation to the Forest Service for improvements upon the grazing lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7985. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, urging increased appropriation for the Bureau of Biological Survey for control of predatory animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7986. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, indorsing House bill 10021, by Mr. Morrow, providing for the establishment of an experiment station in Lea County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7987. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, opposing the putting of Mexican labor on quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration.

7988. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring duty on hides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7989. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, approving an advance in tariff on beef products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7990. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, opposing Senate bill 4264, restricting the sale of livestock to places designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7991. Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, approving House bill 490, to amend the packers and stockyard act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7992. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Immigration Study Commission, Sacramento, Calif., opposing the repeal of the national-origins clause of the immigration quota act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7993. Also, petition of the Cigarmakers Local Union No. 87, Glendale, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Cuban parcel post bill (H. R. 9195); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7994. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of R. V. McKeever, Otley, Iowa, and O. M. Wilson, Monroe, Iowa, drug-

gists, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7995. Also, petition of druggists and other business men of Bloomfield, Iowa, submitted by J. M. Bootsma, Bloomfield, Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7996. Also, petition of H. T. Berry, Pulaski, Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7997. Also, petition of druggists and other business men of Sigourney, Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11) submitted by Paul O. Weller, Sigourney, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7998. Also, petition of druggists and other business men at Newton and Grinnell, Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11) submitted by P. J. Jepson, Newton, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7999. Also, petition of druggists and other business men of Oskaloosa, Eddyville, and New Sharon, Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11), submitted by G. E. Stephenson, Eddyville, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8000. Also, petition of druggists and other business men of Albia, Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11), submitted by E. C. Armstrong, Albia, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8001. Also, petition of druggists and other business men of Newton, Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11), submitted by G. H. Nollen, Newton, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8002. Also, petition of druggists and other business men of Iowa, in support of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11), submitted by C. A. Burt, Delta, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8003. Also, petition of druggists and other business men of Ottumwa, Iowa, submitted by C. A. Hill, Ottumwa, Iowa, in favor of the Capper-Kelley resale price bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8004. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of Lawrence County Pomona Grange, No. 65, Patrons of Husbandry, New Castle, Pa., protesting the construction of more cruisers than actually needed for police protection, and urging the ratification of the Kellogg peace pact; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8005. Also, petition of congregation of the Union Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Mars, Pa., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Revision of Laws.

SENATE

SATURDAY, December 15, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Lord, to whom all things in heaven and earth do bow, be now and evermore the strong tower and defense of this Nation, that Thy people may be sober-minded, truthful, reverent in spirit, and pure in heart. Let no unhallowed words pollute the tongues which Thou hast made to praise and bless Thee, no evil action defile the bodies which Thou hast taught us are the temples of Thy presence. Thou hast crowned our country with vast and marvelous achievements; make us, therefore, worthy of the past and true prophets of the future, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Grant this for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—BOULDER DAM

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I was suffering from a severe headache. I went home early and was not present in the Chamber when the Boulder Dam bill was voted upon. I want to take this occasion, however, to state that if I had been here I would have voted against the bill. I had no idea that it would be finally voted upon at that time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, December 22, 1928, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Thursday, January 3, 1929, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.